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Document part: A43a - Land for new north facing slip roads to/from A3 at Send Marsh/Burnt Common
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/538  Respondent: 8553761 / A Howlett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because it would be disastrous for Send and the A247 would be gridlocked all day, instead of just rush hours.

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25. The traffic light intersection is already a major hazard for pedestrians as the walkway is only wide enough for one person, and unsuitable for parents walking their children to the local schools.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2911  Respondent: 8559745 / Mr Brian East  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common, this would be disastrous for Send and the A247 which is already overloaded and jammed at peak times will become gridlocked. Already noise and pollution levels are excessive and this would certainly worsen to the point of being intolerable.

Send would be taking traffic from the proposed new houses at Wisley, Gosden Hill, Burpham and Blackwell Farm. Much of it would come through the village to and from the A3, M25, Woking and Guildford.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2913  Respondent: 8559745 / Mr Brian East  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common, this would be disastrous for Send and the A247 which is already overloaded and jammed at peak times will become gridlocked. Already noise and pollution levels are excessive and this would certainly worsen to the point of being intolerable.

Send would be taking traffic from the proposed new houses at Wisley, Gosden Hill, Burpham and Blackwell Farm. Much of it would come through the village to and from the A3, M25, Woking and Guildford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to this proposal because it would do nothing to ease the density of traffic on a road which already suffers from long tailbacks at peak times. The A3 regularly has blocked traffic and adding a slip road which only serves the purpose to access a specific site and no other will only make things worse.

This proposal would encourage additional traffic along the very narrow, winding A247 Clandon Road and the Send Barns Lane/Send Road leading to Woking, the traffic along both of which are already at capacity. Send village is a ribbon development of housing along both sides of Send Road, so there is no scope to widen it, and where it ends at the Old Woking roundabout none of the connecting roads can be widened to ease congestion because of the existing surrounding buildings.

This ill-conceived plan to enable major development at Gosden Hill and Wisley completely fails to take account of the serpentine configuration of the Clandon Road and of the inability to improve the traffic flow along it and the Send Road because of the proximity of existing housing.

The suggestion that the land for the slip roads may be gifted should the Wisley airfield development proposal be accepted means that this is really no gift at all, merely an undisguised attempt by that developer to gain approval to build on protected land.

As such it will, if approved, be subject to legal challenge.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
This ill-conceived plan to enable major development at Gosden Hill and Wisley completely fails to take account of the serpentine configuration of the Clandon Road and of the inability to improve the traffic flow along it and the Send Road because of the proximity of existing housing.

The suggestion that the land for the slip roads may be gifted should the Wisley airfield development proposal be accepted means that this is really no gift at all, merely an undisguised attempt by that developer to gain approval to build on protected land.

As such it will, if approved, be subject to legal challenge.

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

Attached documents:
In Send Road adjacent to the junction with Tannery Lane and Sandy Lane is the Send Recreation Ground. This recreational area was Gold Rated by Guildford Borough Council and is one of only about ten in the Borough. It is used by children from the Village and surrounding areas, youth sports teams and personal trainers throughout the week. Increased housing and industry will bring further vehicles and increased pollution to this vulnerable area. Parking in the area is always a problem. In addition to this the local school is advocating children should be walking to school wherever possible. The pavements are very poor and narrow in places. Any increase in traffic would aggravate this problem and the physical danger to children.

In the event of this re-organised junction being included and planned the Parish Council would insist that Potters Lane junction must be closed as it causes many accidents with its poor placement so close to the exit at Burnt Common. There is currently no northbound slip road from Potters Lane and traffic on the A3 is travelling at high speeds which make entry from this point very dangerous.

This is the house called Oatlands, Burnt Common Lane which was refused planning permission for 25 houses about three years ago. It is now proposed to build 400 houses in the vicinity.

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

Attached documents: 8.JPG (40 KB) 7.JPG (19 KB)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7693  Respondent: 8563169 / Send Parish Council (Debbie Hurdle)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

A 43a The proposed Northbound and Southbound slip roads

The proposed slip roads do have some merits, offering the residents of Send and West Clandon quicker access. However, this would come at a very high price in terms of noise and upheaval for neighbours adjacent to the slip roads in Burnt Common Lane and Woodlands.

Another difficulty with this development is that the access to the northbound slip road would run over Manorial land which is at the site. It is apparently owned by the Lord of the Manor or his heirs. The proposed slip road also runs up land that is currently farmed.

The A247 and other feeder roads in the area are already heavily congested at peaks periods. The proposed slip roads to and from the A3 at Burnt Common Interchange would make this congestion even heavier. The villages of Send, West Clandon and Ripley already carry very heavy traffic morning and evening with vehicles going or returning from the A3 and M25. The A247 Clandon Road and the Street in West Clandon are very narrow in places as are many of the lanes and feeder roads around the area as a whole.

In Send Road adjacent to the junction with Tannery Lane and Sandy Lane is the Send Recreation Ground. This recreational area was Gold Rated by Guildford Borough Council and is one of only about ten in the Borough. It is used by children from the Village and surrounding areas, youth sports teams and personal trainers throughout the week. Increased housing and industry will bring further vehicles and increased pollution to this vulnerable area. Parking in the area is always a problem. In addition to this the local school is advocating children should be walking to school wherever possible. The pavements are very poor and narrow in places. Any increase in traffic would aggravate this problem and the physical danger to children.

In the event of this reorganised junction being included and planned the Parish Council would insist that Potters Lane junction must be closed as it causes many accidents with its poor placement so close to the exit at Burnt Common. There
is currently no northbound slip road from Potters Lane and traffic on the A3 is travelling at high speeds which make entry from this point very dangerous.

This is the house called Oatlands, Burnt Common Lane which was refused planning permission for 25 houses about three years ago. It is now proposed to build 400 houses in the vicinity.

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

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1453  **Respondent:** 8568193 / Miss Edwina Attwood  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

16.1 **OBJECT** to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition of north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. **There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.**

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

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/267  **Respondent:** 8568673 / Enid Morgan  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

Policy 43A

The amount of land needed for this totally unnecessary plan is huge. We already have adequate access to the A3 southbound and northbound

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

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/8243  **Respondent:** 8570593 / John Newman  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Policy A43a - Land for new north facing slip roads to/from A3 is dependent on the owners of Garlick's Arch gifting the land for the slip road on condition of receiving planning permission for housing. Use of slip roads will have a severe impact on the population of Wisley, Send, the Clandon's and other local populations.

The decision was made before they built the Wisley bypass not to have slip roads to/from A3. With the increase in traffic why should this have changed?

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2762  Respondent: 8571137 / G Mansbridge  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to your plan for the proposed new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because of the total traffic gridlock through Send which will definitely result if this plan went ahead.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7584  Respondent: 8571137 / G Mansbridge  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to your plan for the proposed new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because of the total traffic gridlock through Send which will definitely result if this plan went ahead.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2676  Respondent: 8575585 / Ian Macpherson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A43a : Land for new north facing slip roads to/from A3

Functional, and a needed purpose. However it is important that the highest level of design and fit into the landscape be deployed, because of the great sensitivity at that point.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID: PSLPS16/1656  Respondent: 8575649 / Ian Reeves  Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I also object to the new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common, site A43a, which will add severe pressure to traffic in the Send and Send Marsh area. This area is already overloaded with traffic and would become gridlocked with the added pressure from the proposed 2,000 new houses at Wisley Airfield, 2,000 new houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham and 1,850 at Blackwell Farm. The local roads are incapable of taking this pressure and noise and pollution levels, already excessive, would become unbearable.

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

Attached documents:

**Comment ID: PSLPS16/574  Respondent: 8579233 / Mrs Purrett  Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the projected plan for new north facing sl~ roads to/from Send March/Burnt Common. The A247 from Old Woking through to Clandon is already over crowded with cars, etc, and this can only be exacerbated by increased traffic from all the new projected housing areas, ie A25, A35, A43, A43 and A44 a total of 4,484 houses, the majority of which will have at least one car. The Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley along with the A3 and the M25 are already very heavily used by traffic coming to and from Woking and Guildford. When these become congested for whatever reason, the problem is greatly exacerbated. On a regular basis it can take me up to five minutes to get out of my small road. The A247 is not a road that can be widened due to the housing on both sides of the road and is already subject to severe gridlocks during rush hours and school times.

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

Attached documents:

**Comment ID: PSLPS16/7948  Respondent: 8581505 / Burpham Neighbourhood Forum (Jim Allen)  Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

The Policy A43a has been slipped into the Plan at Reg. 19 stage, with:-

- no previous public consultation at Reg. 18
- no official documented consultees’ consultation
• no apparent traffic modelling to discover its effects on local traffic patterns. No consideration has been given to:-
• south of this proposed junction. The south bound ‘on’ directly affects the south ‘off’ at the Policy A25 site, which is less than 2km from the Policy A43a site. One or other will need to be dropped from the plan.
• in respect of potential four way just north of Policy A25 site, this will be in direct conflict with Policy A43a site.
• the only village to benefit from this proposal is Ripley. All other villages will see an increase in traffic. The A3 traffic route changes, as proposed, are detrimental to remaining routes to the A25 and Woking areas.
• No solution to the traffic south of this location would be found by building these slip roads determined by Policy A43a. An expensive waste! The money could be used to solve 5 villages’ traffic problems, if the four way is built south of the current north off exit to Burnt Common as per Policy A25.

It is therefore a non starter for the community, interfering with traffic flows in a detrimental way and will increase traffic in West Clandon. The ‘ability’ to miss out Guildford for large commercial vehicles will lead to West Clandon on the A247 becoming a rat run for vehicles heading to the A25 and A246.

The increasing pollution would cause distress to the residents.

The proposal solves nothing, therefore is illogical and unsound.

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

Attached documents:
The addition of north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6903  Respondent: 8589953 / Michael R. Murphy  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because Send would have to take traffic from the proposed 2000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 at Gosden Hill and 1850 at Blackwell Farm as well as 485 from Send itself. This is in addition to what it takes at the moment. Much of this traffic to and fro the A3, M25, Woking and Guildford would go through Send. Send Road, which is already overloaded, would face gridlock. This would exacerbate noise and pollution levels which are already excessive and is wholly unacceptable.

I OBJECT to the new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because it is being presented as a way of facilitating the movement of a massive increase in vehicles whereas in reality it would cause havoc on the A247 and the many feeder roads in Ripley and Clandon in addition to Send.

I OBJECT to the fact that Guildford Councillors approved the Local Plan before the Transport Assessment had even been published which indicates what scant regard they had for the traffic implications which are at the forefront of residents’ worries. They have to contend with the problem every day in terms of delays, pollution and noise which are already destroying our villages as decent places in which to live.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8225  Respondent: 8589953 / Michael R. Murphy  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to this proposed new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because much of the traffic to and from the A3 , the M25 , Woking and Guildford would be going through to Send Road which is already at full capacity. It would be total gridlock as this road funnels into a small roundabout and very small congested roads in Old Woking.

The proposed junction would have to take traffic from the proposed 2000 houses at Wisley Airfield,2000 houses at Gosden Hill,Burpham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm, this would be a total disaster for the Village of Send.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2947  Respondent: 8590753 / Mr Michael Anning  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/793  Respondent: 8597761 / Mrs Pippa Fleming  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

In particular, I object on the following basis.

1. I object to the creation of a new 4 way interchange onto the A3 on the A247 (Policy A43A) as this would add to the ever increasing levels of traffic on the A247, A3 and through Send and Clandon. Send would become a through route to and from the A3 and will become gridlocked all day.

2. I object to the impact that Policy A43A will have on the air quality for those living in the surrounding areas and for future generations.

3. I object to the impact on residents that the resulting noise pollution of Policy A43A will have.

4. I object to the inclusion of land at Garlick's Arch, Burnt Common and the proposed 400 houses and 7000 sq m of industrial warehousing on that site (Policy 43). Policy A43 and A43A were included at the last minute. They were not in the Regulation 18 draft and had not been consulted upon prior to the inclusion 2016 Local Plan.

5. I object to the impact of Policy A43 on ancient woodland on that site, on noise pollution and air pollution levels. The site is also prone to flooding.

6. I object to the impact of Policy A43 and A43A on local infrastructure. Congestion levels on A247 are already increasing at an alarming rate and will be further exacerbated by the development of Garlick's Arch as the residents will have to rely on the use of private cars.
7. I object to the unsustainable nature of the site at Garlick’s Arch (Policy 43).

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7653  Respondent: 8606977 / Mrs Sarah Tipping  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

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

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4797  Respondent: 8640353 / Julian Cranwell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

We object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a). The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved. We object to the proposed Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C). The Infrastructure Schedule sets out the key infrastructure requirements on which the delivery of the plan depends. For each of the Key Allocated Sites in the borough it identifies infrastructure projects that are required, except for Garlick’s Arch (A43) which is not mentioned. It is clear that the Plan takes no account of the infrastructure required for this site and is therefore not fit for purpose.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/901  Respondent: 8703937 / Alan Sussex  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to Policy A43a, the new on/off slip roads proposed to and from the A3 by the bridge on the A247 over the A3. These new junctions are ill conceived and will considerably increase traffic flows in the Burnt common, Send and Clandon areas.
SEND CANNOT TAKE INCREASED TRAFFIC FLOWS

The A247 through Send would be gridlocked at rush hours, and at other times. At present there is a constant flow of traffic around the Burntcommon roundabout (by the Shell petrol station and Little Waitrose) all day and evening.

I also fear that those of us living in Boughton Hall Avenue, about 100 metres from this roundabout, will find access to and from the Avenue very difficult indeed. The junction with the B2215 is our only entry and exit point and there are at present 76 properties in this estate.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1475  Respondent: 8726529 / Eric Palmer  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

1. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.
Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

**Attached documents:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1573</th>
<th>Respondent: 8726529 / Eric Palmer</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7284</th>
<th>Respondent: 8732353 / Simon Marshall</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to site A43a the on and off ramp at Burnt Common which will only lead to yet more traffic congestion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2334</th>
<th>Respondent: 8741377 / Lisanne Mealing</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The increased volume of traffic will severely impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1820</th>
<th>Respondent: 8744161 / Michael Bridge</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:
I object to the fact that the road infrastructure through Send has not been thought about and the consequences of putting a large interchange on this site would cause gridlock. The amount of traffic this will create through Send is unfeasible as there is only one two way street that goes through the centre of the village. The intersection would have to take traffic from the proposed 2000 new houses in Wisley Airfield, 2000 new houses in Gosden Hill and 1850 new houses at Blackwell Farm. The traffic form Woking heading to and from the A3 and M25 would come through Send. The traffic, congestion is one aspect but there other considerations such as noise pollution, air pollution levels, weight of traffic on country roads and the damage that will be caused not to mention the destruction of the village and the way of life here.

I object to the proposal to build 400 houses and 7000sqm of industrial space at Garlick's Arch.

This site was not included in the Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan so has not had full consultation. The manor in which it has been slipped into the Plan is underhand and unfair. The site is subject to flooding and is covered by ancient woodland. The industrial space is not needed here and any extra space required should be included in the existing industrial site of Slyfield. The projected housing figures understand to have been exaggerated, so there is no need for this number of houses to be built in and around Send.

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

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:
The addition of north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7498  Respondent: 8772801 / David French  Agent:

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

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4491  Respondent: 8774369 / Gary Cooper  Agent:

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

I object to the proposed new 4 way A3 junction

The proposed new junction could help parts of the area such as the centre of Ripley, but that benefit is entirely outweighed by the hitherto unimaginable volumes of traffic which would cause gridlock at Burnt Common roundabout as well as on the entire section of A247 from West Clandon to Woking. With these areas gridlocked, traffic would need to find alternative routes and the previously little known lanes around the area would be ruined also. This one singular act of folly would cause immeasurable damage to a wide area.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8044  
**Respondent:** 8794529 / Paul Tubman  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the creation of a new interchange between the A247 and the A3 at Burnt Common. Whilst this is seen as providing access to the A3 for the new development at Wisley, it will inevitably provide easier access from the developments at Wisley, and Gosden Hill to Woking, thereby significantly increasing traffic through Send in to Old Woking on the A247, a route that is already very congested and not able to cope during peak periods. Noise and pollution levels will exceed the already high levels.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2218  
**Respondent:** 8796321 / Nick Etches  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43a

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

In policies SRN9 and SRN10 I note the change in responsibility for delivering new A3 slip roads at Burnt Common from Surrey County Council to either Highways England or developer. I have concerns that if delivered by Highways England alone there would be no local level control over if/when/how the scheme was delivered. This is an existing concern for other schemes including SRN2 and SRN3 (Stoke interchange and M25 J10/A3 interchange), where Highways England have sole responsibility.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/729  
**Respondent:** 8796481 / Sally Erhardt  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the building of a new junction at Send/Burnt common. I cannot see how this could possibly be proposed when it was turned down a few years ago, by the council and highways, when requested by the Newark Lane Residents Association, for its detrimental effects on the traffic on the A3- how have these effects changed? This junction can only have a detrimental effect on Ripley, pulling in traffic from Woking, Shere and many surrounding areas. The Street in West Clandon and Ripley High Street along with the road from Send will become congested rat runs.

There seems to be little that I agree with in this plan. Presumably because of Brexit it will need to be rethought and I do hope that the comments made to this and the previous draft will receive more thorough consideration.
1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a).

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:
2.3 A43A Land for North Facing Slip Roads on A3 at Burnt Common

I object to this development. No necessity for this new North facing junction was identified in previous versions of the local plan. The main justification is to improve access to the proposed Wisley Airfield redevelopment. It is difficult to justify this as that site is 6 kilometres away and can only be accessed through the already stressed local roads. In addition, GBC has recently rejected the latest planning application for the Wisley Site. New infrastructure should only be approved when the final nature of the Wisley development is known. Providing a northbound A3 access at Send will have a very negative effect on the A247 which has the problems already described above. The new junction will certainly attract commercial traffic from South Woking which currently accesses the A3 via the inadequate A245 or via the narrow Newark Lane. A new Woking to A3 access road was proposed when we moved to Send in 1981 and we are still waiting.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7436  Respondent: 8810849 / Charles Lee  Agent:

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

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7485  Respondent: 8810849 / Charles Lee  Agent:

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

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.
The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5981</th>
<th>Respondent: 8812833 / Simon P Hill</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to site A43a the on and off ramp at Burnt Common / Clandon as this will make the traffic problems currently suffered by Ripley and Send far worse, attracting vehicles from a wide area into trying to access the A3 and M25. When there is an accident or breakdown on the A3 or M25 the villages and surrounding become grid locked, this proposal will cause this to happen even sooner.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4550</th>
<th>Respondent: 8813505 / Peter Grimble</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1347</th>
<th>Respondent: 8813601 / Gaenor Richards</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of 'through' traffic.
The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) , is Sound? ( ) , is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7720</th>
<th>Respondent: 8817377 / Mark Silcock</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
<th>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) , is Sound? ( ) , is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because it would be disastrous for Send and the (A247) would be at a standstill all day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) , is Sound? ( ) , is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposed north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is minimal requirement for existing local traffic to access and egress the A3 to the north save to mitigate loads through Ripley, but the addition could draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. There has been no impact assessment for this last minute inclusion.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2784</th>
<th>Respondent: 8830145 / Peter Smart</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I also object to Policy 43A - the proposed changes to the A3 junction at Burnt Common. Traffic in the area has got a lot worse over the last five years &amp; this proposal, if implemented, would make it significantly worse. The traffic already queues along Send Road &amp; up Send Barns Lane to the Burnt Common roundabout in the morning rush hour. In the evening this is reversed as it queues back along Send Barns Lane &amp; right through the village to Old Woking. This would be significantly worse if the proposed junctions were built &amp; even worse if the development at Garlick’s Arch &amp; the others which are proposed at Gosden Hill Farm &amp; Wisley were to go ahead. Indeed Send would be grid-locked for much of the day, as it is currently when there is an accident on the M25 or A3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7885</th>
<th>Respondent: 8834401 / Property Consultant (John Everritt)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A3 Highway Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the inclusion of land for new on/off slip roads at Burnt Common. These would draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic from the area and funnel it through the A247 through West Clandon and or the Ripley Road from East Clandon via HM Prison Ripley and Tithe Barns Road. Both these routes are narrow and dangerous and the addition of traffic to them to gain/leave A3 access would be seriously detrimental to both villages, in terms of road safety, road damage and air pollution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7885</th>
<th>Respondent: 8834401 / Property Consultant (John Everritt)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Further access onto the A 3 at Burnt common, travelling north, will only increase the traffic particularly at rush hours travelling towards the M 25 intersection. Currently West Clandon’s Street is unable to cope with any volume of traffic. This proposal will only increase the problem. The promise of the Developers of Garlic Arch, have not provided any financial proof of their ability to fund the substantial infrastructure, envisaged.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment ID: PSLPS16/5625  Respondent: 8835809 / Richard Golding  Agent:  

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT, this additional junction on the A3 is within 2.5 miles of an existing junction. Junctions increase the risk of accidents with drivers leaving it late to get in the correct lane to leave a fast road, where as traffic joining effectively reduce the principal road by one lane. It will not improve the traffic flow on the local roads, it could even make it worse, as it could draw traffic from the south and southwest of Woking on to the A247 through Send to join the A3, where as they may use the Byfleet road to the A3 junction at Pains Hill This proposal is only there so the council can claim to be doing road infrastructure work to assist with traffic flows that all these proposed development will produce.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3235  Respondent: 8837313 / Maria Baker  Agent:  

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of 'through' traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved. This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/77  Respondent: 8838337 / Gregory Webb  Agent:  

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

1. I OBJECT STRONGLY to Policy A43a – land to be used for new north facing slip roads to the A3 at Send/ Burnt Common
   1. This is the first time this policy has been tabled. It is a huge potential development with wide reaching implications for local residents, traffic flow across Guildford and Woking Boroughs, the environment, the idea that Send is a village and that we live in a semi-rural community
   2. It is unacceptable that such a major development could be introduced by GBC without much more rigorous evaluation
   3. The introduction of this junction would promote further development – when in fact any new junction should be driven by development need. GBC is putting the cart before the horse.

1. I OBJECT STRONGLY to Policy A43a – land to be used for new north facing slip roads to the A3 at Send/ Burnt Common
   1. This is the first time this policy has been tabled. It is a huge potential development with wide reaching implications for local residents, traffic flow across Guildford and Woking Boroughs, the environment, the idea that Send is a village and that we live in a semi-rural community
   2. It is unacceptable that such a major development could be introduced by GBC without much more rigorous evaluation
   3. The introduction of this junction would promote further development – when in fact any new junction should be driven by development need. GBC is putting the cart before the horse.

1. I OBJECT STRONGLY to Policy A43a – land to be used for new north facing slip roads to the A3 at Send/ Burnt Common
   1. This is the first time this policy has been tabled. It is a huge potential development with wide reaching implications for local residents, traffic flow across Guildford and Woking Boroughs, the environment, the idea that Send is a village and that we live in a semi-rural community
   2. It is unacceptable that such a major development could be introduced by GBC without much more rigorous evaluation
   3. The introduction of this junction would promote further development – when in fact any new junction should be driven by development need. GBC is putting the cart before the horse.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3454  
**Respondent:** 8840161 / Richard Ayears  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

1. I object to Policy A43A as there is no promise of delivery, lack of detail from Highways England as to the delivery and timing of any construction. If A43 Garlick’s Arch is included against my objection the plan is to deliver the homes in the first 5 years yet the roads infrastructure is not proposed until years 5 – 10 leading to further traffic congestion and blighting the lives of local people. There are no proposals within the plan to improve the traffic flow on the A3 or M25 so traffic will just sit during the daily commutes causing greater pollution and lead to motorists trying to by-pass the congestion through small and inappropriate country lanes.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7178  
**Respondent:** 8840161 / Richard Ayears  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to Policy A43A as there is no promise of delivery, lack of detail from Highways England as to the delivery and timing of any construction. If A43 Garlick’s Arch is included against my objection the plan is to deliver the homes in the first 5 years yet the roads infrastructure is not proposed until years 5 – 10 leading to further traffic congestion and blighting the lives of local people. There are no proposals within the plan to improve the traffic flow on the A3 or M25 so traffic will just sit during the daily commutes causing greater pollution and lead to motorists trying to by-pass the congestion through small and inappropriate country lanes.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8135  
**Respondent:** 8843361 / Adrian Atkinson  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a). The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

I object to the proposed Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C). The Infrastructure
Schedule sets out the key infrastructure requirements on which the delivery of the plan depends. For each of the Key Allocated Sites in the borough it identifies infrastructure projects that are required, except for Garlick’s Arch (A43) which is not mentioned. It is clear that the Plan takes no account of the infrastructure required for this site and is therefore not fit for purpose.

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

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/2752  Respondent: 8853025 / Charles Gibson  Agent: |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |

1. I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common. It would result in the A247 (Send Road) being gridlocked all day. There are no proposals to improve or widen this road. Send will be the through route to Woking for traffic leaving the M25 at Junction 10, the new development of 2,000 houses at Wisley and also the new development of 2,000 houses at Burpham. I further object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25.

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

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/7591  Respondent: 8853025 / Charles Gibson  Agent: |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common. It would result in the A247 (Send Road) being gridlocked all day. There are no proposals to improve or widen this road. Send will be the through route to Woking for traffic leaving the M25 at Junction 10, the new development of 2,000 houses at Wisley and also the new development of 2,000 houses at Burpham. I further object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25.

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

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/6611  Respondent: 8854785 / Desmond McCann  Agent: |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |
I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because it would be disastrous for Send and the (A247) would be gridlocked all day.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5257  Respondent: 8855969 / Jonathan Murphy  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8023  Respondent: 8858113 / Ramsey Nagaty  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a). The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

I object to the proposed Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C). The Infrastructure Schedule sets out the key infrastructure requirements on which the delivery of the plan depends. For each of the Key Allocated Sites in the borough it identifies infrastructure projects that are required, except for Garlick’s Arch (A43) which is not mentioned. It is clear that the Plan takes no account of the infrastructure required for this site and is therefore not fit for purpose.

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

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/7314  Respondent: 8859585 / Claire Yates  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to the new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. Send Road and its tributary roads are already heavily congested with traffic and the amount of additional traffic would cause gridlock to the roads of Send.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4953  Respondent: 8862465 / Nik Church  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6846  Respondent: 8865985 / Grant Ringshaw  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

The proposed addition of north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc.) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/679  Respondent: 8875233 / Richard Hiam  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1079  Respondent: 8875361 / P A Clarke  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the proposal to create extra entry and exit slip roads from A3, London bound, off the A247 Clandon Road which will add to further congestion on the Burntcommon roundabout. Also the A247 which runs through Send village would be used as a major artery into Woking destroying the villages with almost constant gridlock and health issues in respect of exhaust emissions.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1080  Respondent: 8875361 / P A Clarke  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

The only entry/exit from Boughton Hall Avenue is onto to the 82215 approximately 100 yards from the Burntcommon roundabout. In busy times it is difficult to get out of the Avenue but with the increased traffic load it will be even worse.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3469  Respondent: 8875457 / Mark Ground  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
16. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of 'through' traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clondon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Pion does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1628  Respondent: 8880929 / Maurice Dawes  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common as this would create a "rat run" and the A247 would become gridlocked all day and I would not be able to easily turn right out of the road where I live.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1633  Respondent: 8880929 / Maurice Dawes  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the new interchange and believe that Send would become a cut through to the A3/M25.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3255  Respondent: 8881345 / Lynne Ground  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)
The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2579  Respondent: 8883841 / Pamela French  Agent:

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

16. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7474  Respondent: 8883841 / Pamela French  Agent:

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

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.
This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

7. I OBJECT to the proposed A3 junction as this is not land that is owned by GBC or under the highways and covers an area which is owned as a memorial.

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

Attached documents:

14. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

I feel the need to highlight that the addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for my local community. By creating an access point to drive on to the A3 to the north, will create a draw for a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

I am also concerned that the fields behind my property will be used as site access/egress with a typical works compound, and of course the construction site, for the entire works period. Given, it’s proximity this will see a 24 hour security fenced and lit compound. Movements of heavily construction traffic within a short distance from my house, will happen 5 or 6 days a week to amount to thousands of movements of material away and deliveries. My whole family will suffer the consequences of noise pollution, dust pollution, and construction activity for the duration of the development.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Clandon and Burnt Common. This increased funneling will cause immense damage to those areas with narrow roads, all increasing the possibility of road traffic accidents.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:
1.1 **We object** to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a). The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

1.2 The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

1.3 **We object** to the proposed Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C). The Infrastructure Schedule sets out the key infrastructure requirements on which the delivery of the plan depends. For each of the Key Allocated Sites in the borough it identifies infrastructure projects that are required, except for Garlick’s Arch (A43) which is not mentioned. It is clear that the Plan takes no account of the infrastructure required for this site and is therefore not fit for purpose.

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

**Attached documents:**
1. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be no solution for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc.) and the A25 will now go through Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7321  Respondent: 8900641 / Caroline Carr  Agent:

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

- I object to sites 43a the on and off ramp at Clandon – this will seriously increase traffic problems through Ripley and Send and not alleviate them

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1999  Respondent: 8900705 / Susan Fuller  Agent:

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

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The additional north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking and Guildford would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally, traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1890  Respondent: 8901761 / Michael and Ceril Brooke  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

- I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously - air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25/ A3 junction, is in excess of EU-permitted levels. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, impacting the health of all current and future residents. This is obviously a key concern as a mother of two young children raised and schooled in the area

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3947  Respondent: 8901953 / I.G. Howell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

The 'cloverleaf' junction proposed to service the Garlick’s Arch site, together with two new north-facing slip roads requiring even more Green Belt land is a massive undertaking out of all proportion to the demonstrated need. The effect on surrounding roads has been given insufficient consideration. Send Barns Lane and its extension to Old Woking would be brought to a standstill, unless the streets of Old Woking were seriously upgraded. The adoption of Send Infants School as the site for a new St Bedes Middle School with access from the A247 has serious implications for an upgraded main road through Send and the implied risks to safety.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8232  Respondent: 8903265 / Susan Anderson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.
The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)
It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4433  Respondent: 8906305 / Anne Fort  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition of north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2177  Respondent: 8907905 / G.A. Phillips  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

5. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common.

The addition of a new on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster in the making.

There is no requirement to access the A3 in this location.
Any new A3 access/exit could be at the Ripley end of the A247. The existing on/off ramps could be upgraded to make two more ramps, one to exit the A3 North bound the other to access the A3 South bound. This addition will increase the flow of traffic through both Send and Ripley, which are both suffering from traffic congestion or Upgrade the A3100 Clay Lane access at Burpham.

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

Attached documents:

---

I object to this proposal because it would do nothing to ease the density of traffic on a road which already suffers from long tailbacks at peak times. The A3 regularly has blocked traffic and adding a slip road which only serves the purpose to access a specific site and no other will only make things worse.

This proposal would encourage additional traffic along the very narrow, winding A247 Clandon Road and the Send Barns Lane/Send Road leading to Woking, the traffic along both of which are already at capacity. Send village is a ribbon development of housing along both sides of Send Road, so there is no scope to widen it, and where it ends at the Old Woking roundabout none of the connecting roads can be widened to ease congestion because of the existing surrounding buildings.

This ill-conceived plan to enable major development at Gosden Hill and Wisley completely fails to take account of the serpentine configuration of the Clandon Road and of the inability to improve the traffic flow along it and the Send Road because of the proximity of existing housing.

The suggestion that the land for the slip roads may be gifted should the Wisley airfield development proposal be accepted means that this is really no gift at all, merely an undisguised attempt by that developer to gain approval to build on protected land.

As such it **will, if approved, be subject to legal challenge**

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

Attached documents:

---

Construction of north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be terrible for local communities, drawing in a huge amount of extra traffic transiting through Ripley and surrounding villages.

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2313  
**Respondent:** 8914049 / Diana Bridges  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

Policy A43a: Land for new north facing slip roads (page 223)

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6262  
**Respondent:** 8921569 / Steven Cliff  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

---

Document page number 41

---

Section page number 40 of 350
The preferred route for many travelers from London or the M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Also, traffic from areas such as Merrow and the A25 will transit through Clandon and Burnt Common if these ramps are built, causing huge damage to these areas on rural roads.

The Local Plan does not take account of the requirements of local communities or the Borough in relation to this point. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/8027  **Respondent:** 8923777 / Andrew Mitchell  **Agent:**  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a  
**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the A43a on and off ramp at Clandon, it would increase the traffic problems in the villages and at peak times would increase the number of dangerous drivers.

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

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2486  **Respondent:** 8923905 / Claire Bridges  **Agent:**  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a  
**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Policy A43a: Land for new north facing slip roads (page 223)

I object to this proposal because it would do nothing to ease the density of traffic on a road which already suffers from long tailbacks at peak times. The A3 regularly has blocked traffic and adding a slip road which only serves the purpose to access a specific site and no other will only make things worse.

This proposal would encourage additional traffic along the very narrow, winding A247 Glandon Road and the Send Barns Lane/Send Road leading to Woking, the traffic along both of which are already at capacity. Send village is a ribbon development of housing along both sides of Send Road, so there is no scope to widen it, and where it ends at the Old Woking roundabout none of the connecting roads can be widened to ease congestion because of the existing surrounding buildings.

This ill-conceived plan to enable major development at Gosden Hill and Wisley completely fails to take account of the serpentine configuration of the Glandon Road and of the inability to improve the traffic flow along it and the Send Road because of the proximity of existing housing.

The suggestion that the land for the slip roads may be gifted should the Wisley airfield development proposal be accepted means that this is really no gift at all, merely an undisguised attempt by that developer to gain approval to build on protected land.

As such it will, if approved, be subject to legal challenge.
Policy A43a: Land for new north facing slip roads (page 223)

I object to this proposal because it would do nothing to ease the density of traffic on a road which already suffers from long tailbacks at peak times. The A3 regularly has blocked traffic and adding a slip road which only serves the purpose to access a specific site and no other will only make things worse.

This proposal would encourage additional traffic along the very narrow, winding A247 Clandon Road and the Send Barns Lane/Send Road leading to Woking, the traffic along both of which are already at capacity. Send village is a ribbon development of housing along both sides of Send Road, so there is no scope to widen it, and where it ends at the Old Woking roundabout none of the connecting roads can be widened to ease congestion because of the existing surrounding buildings.

This ill-conceived plan to enable major development at Gosden Hill and Wisley completely fails to take account of the serpentine configuration of the Clandon Road and of the inability to improve the traffic flow along it and the Send Road because of the proximity of existing housing.

The suggestion that the land for the slip roads may be gifted should the Wisley airfield development proposal be accepted means that this is really no gift at all, merely an undisguised attempt by that developer to gain approval to build on protected land.

As such it **will, if approved, be subject to legal challenge**

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

Attacked documents:

---

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.
This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/291  Respondent: 8926657 / Lian Grieves  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

10) I OBJECT to the proposed on and off ramp at Clandon (site A43a). This will not resolve traffic problems in the villages and may actually make them worse

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5780  Respondent: 8928033 / P. Richardson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send.

Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5896  Respondent: 8928289 / Trevor Skerritt  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)
The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow, etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/282  Respondent: 8929921 / Caspar Hancock  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

10) I OBJECT to the proposed on and off ramp at Clandon (site A43a), which will actually increase traffic problems in the villages.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/960  Respondent: 8933121 / Bryan Jackson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the proposed new slip roads off the A3 your ref A43a. This will create a bigger rat-run through Send Village.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7734  Respondent: 8940225 / Glen Ruddy  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.
The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4996  Respondent: 8954977 / Patrick Sheard  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. The construction of this interchange would result in a vast increase in traffic though Send to Woking and beyond. In addition to the traffic that currently passes through Ripley and down Newark Lane it would also encourage traffic that currently travels from Esher and Cobham to Woking through West Byfleet along the A245 (and vice-versa), to divert through Send (both of which routes are already gridlocked in the morning and evening rush hours), making Send Road more gridlocked and polluted than it already is. This interchange solves nothing, merely diverts traffic to Woking via another route. If it was a solution it would have been proposed in the previous plan, rather than appearing as a last-minute amendment to a fatally flawed Local Plan.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7005  Respondent: 8954977 / Patrick Sheard  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Site A43a On/Off Ramps at Burnt Common

The Society objects to the proposed new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. The construction of this interchange would result in a vast increase in traffic though Send to Woking and beyond. In addition to the traffic that currently passes through Ripley and down Newark Lane it would also encourage traffic that currently travels from Esher and Cobham to Woking through West Byfleet along the A245 (and vice-versa), to divert through Send (both of which routes are already gridlocked in the morning and evening rush hours), making Send Road more gridlocked and polluted than it already is. This interchange solves nothing, merely diverts traffic to Woking via another route. If it was a solution it would have been proposed in the previous plan, rather than appearing as a last-minute amendment to a fatally flawed Local Plan.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6680  Respondent: 8974177 / Nigel Mitchell  Agent:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A43a North Facing slip roads to/from A3 at Send Marsh/Burnt Common

Object

Whilst acknowledging that additional access and egress to the A3 would be desirable, the likelihood is that this will increase the flow of traffic through Send and Burnt Common. It will reduce traffic through Ripley and assist in the reduction in traffic at Wisley, and therefore benefit that proposed development. The on and off slip roads would be used by traffic from Woking and there appears to be no evidence of collaboration with Woking Borough Council on this route.

The entrance to the junction on Clandon Road will need to be significantly improved so that there is no additional congestion on the new off slip from the A3. I would suggest that a new roundabout will be required as the current right turn is only occasionally used; if this proposal were to be delivered the right turn would be in constant use by vehicles going to Woking.

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

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5910</th>
<th>Respondent: 8979265 / Rachel Taylor</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

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

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7109</th>
<th>Respondent: 9042049 / Victoria Sandu</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the creation of a new interchange between the A247 and the A3 at Burnt Common. Whilst this is seen as providing access to the A3 for the new development at Wisley, it will inevitably provide easier access from the developments at Wisley, and Gosden Hill to Woking, thereby significantly increasing traffic through Send in to Old Woking on the A247, a route that is already very congested and not able to cope during peak periods. Noise and pollution levels will exceed the already high levels.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2452</th>
<th>Respondent: 9081089 / William D Barker OBE</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to new sites Garlicks Arch being introduced as an afterthought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added without the consent of Highways England.</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3915</th>
<th>Respondent: 9323361 / Paul Holden</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I object to an expanded A3 interchange at Burnt Common,</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2975</th>
<th>Respondent: 9607905 / Anne Pascoe</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/all ramps at Burnt Common</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of 'through' traffic. The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved. This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3495</th>
<th>Respondent: 10563457 / John Creasey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common as the A247 would be gridlocked all day and a disaster for Send.

I object as the Transport Evidence is Incomplete and unreliable to the proposed interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common as Send would be used as a diversion to A3/M2S.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1100</th>
<th>Respondent: 10563777 / Hazel Creasey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJE.CT to the proposed new road junction as this will involve the A247 becoming the major route through Send between Woking and the A3 The houses on Send Road and part of Send Barns Lane are close to the road so pollution is a major issue.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3135</th>
<th>Respondent: 10570049 / Jenny Peachey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site A43a - I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because it would be disastrous for Send and the A247 to Old Woking would be gridlocked all day. There are schools, shops and a bus route along this already congested village road. In the other direction the A247 towards Newlands Corner - the section between the Onslow Arms and Clandon Park is very narrow with bends and there is only just room for cars to pass each other but lorries and buses have to mount the footway.

Site A43a - I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is Incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25. This interchange will cause dangerous queueing on the A3 in both directions.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5963</th>
<th>Respondent: 10627681 / John Davis</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposed interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because Send would be need to take the traffic from the proposed Wisley Airfield site and from Gosdon Hill thus causing horrendous traffic jams and nobody getting anywhere quickly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5653</th>
<th>Respondent: 10633761 / Guida Esteves</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a) New on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would cause irreversible damage to the local communities. These are deemed enable to enable the strategic site of Wisley Airfield which is 4km away. The current road network in the village is already overstretched. The GBC Local Plan should be aspirational when looking to support the level of growth proposed. The existing road network expansion is constrained by its location and setting within existing villages and urban housing. As such a forward looking plan would look towards new roads rather than over-burdening the existing roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6057</th>
<th>Respondent: 10644417 / D Hill</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The entrance on to the A3 is something that is required already.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2156</th>
<th>Respondent: 10667073 / Trudi Harris</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of 'through' traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:
2.2 A43A Land for North Facing Slip Roads on A3 at Burnt Common

I object to this development. No necessity for this new North facing junction was identified in previous versions of the local plan. The main justification is to improve access to the proposed Wisley Airfield redevelopment. It is difficult to justify this as that site is 6 kilometres away and can only be accessed through the already stressed local roads. In addition, GBC has recently rejected the latest planning application for the Wisley Site. New infrastructure should only be approved when the final nature of the Wisley development is known. Providing a northbound A3 access at Send will have a very negative effect on the A247 which has the problems already described above. The new junction will certainly attract commercial traffic from South Woking which currently accesses the A3 via the inadequate A245 or via the narrow Newark Lane. A new Woking to A3 access road was proposed when we moved to Send in 1981 and we are still waiting.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2072   Respondent: 10717985 / Alison Drennan   Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• I object to the new interchange this GBC proposes to be built on the A3 at Burnt Common. This would cause gridlock in our village, be detrimental to residents’ health and cause, as a consequence, increased risk of accidents and harm. The Transport Evidence used by GBC shows there will be increased congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25. If this went ahead Send would become gridlocked as traffic from the proposed 5850 houses at Wisley, Gosden Hill Burpham and Blackwell farm would all impact on our village and roads.

• I object that the Transport Evidence for the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common is incomplete and unreliable.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3533   Respondent: 10721537 / Stephen Niblett   Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be enormous congestion because Send would undoubtedly be used as a cut through to the A3/M25.

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

Attached documents:

---

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved and negatively impact on air quality and the health and safety of pedestrians and cyclists and increase noise pollution.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard.

There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the Council making last minute significant changes to the plan, such as the Garlick's Arch development in Send and the addition of a major alteration/enlargement of the junction on the A3 at Burnt Common. There are also many other significant changes to the 2014 plan, which require full consultation according to Regulation 18, not the limited form of Regulation 19.

We think that placing the very short six week Local Plan consultation in summer when many people take holidays is a deliberate act to minimise residents' opportunity to fully review the vast amount of documentation comprised in the Plan and make any appropriate objections if required.

I object to both these developments on the grounds that there was improper use of Regulation 18; no local consultation; that Garlick's Arch is green belt land which includes an area of ancient woodland and from personal recollection, a private burial of the late Mrs Molyneux-Chil d was undertaken on this land.

I object to the alteration to the A3 junction at Burnt Common as it has not been part of a full infrastructure review and consultation , and was added to the plan at the last minute.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5777  **Respondent:** 10723553 / Judith Pound  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the inclusion of land for a new interchange at Burnt Common (A43a). This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7546  **Respondent:** 10723553 / Judith Pound  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT TO site A43a the on and off ramp at Clandon – this will increase traffic problems, as more people use Ripley, Send and Clandon as a cut through.

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

**Attached documents:**
Comment ID: PSLPS16/3198  Respondent: 10724769 / P. Broughton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the proposal to build a 4 way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common in order to facilitate this development and other nearby developments. This would be disastrous for the local area. Commuters would be drawn to this area and further congest an area that is already badly congested with traffic. It will mean that the narrow Send Road (A247) will be gridlocked all day as would most surrounding roads. Send will be the through route to Woking for traffic leaving the M25 at Junction 10, and the new development of 2,000 houses at Wisley and also the new development of 2,000 houses at Burpham

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4088  Respondent: 10725345 / T. Sharman  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the proposed 4 way interchange on the A3 at burnt common. This would be disastrous for Send and Ripley and would add to the destruction of the area. We have lived in Send for 30 years and realise some change is necessary but what GBC is proposing will ruin instead of enhancing the whole area.

This is a serious matter

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2233  Respondent: 10725537 / D. Warriner  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the A43a ramp at Clandon, this would increase traffic in Ripley

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/954  Respondent: 10726561 / L. Boyle  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Policy A43A. I object to this policy on the following point:

1. The proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because it would be disastrous for Send and the (A247) would be gridlocked all day. I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/402 Respondent: 10727009 / A. Elms Agent:

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

I note a 4-way interchange is proposed onto the A3 at Burnt Common to serve the Garlick's Arch development. Traffic is already bad on the A247 and it is gridlocked every morning. It would become intolerable if this development took place. It is already gridlocked in the morning and traffic would be at a standstill in the area. Send Barns Lane would become a through route for Woking.

I object to the development of the proposed new 4-way interchange from the A3 at Burnt Common. Policy A43

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5863 Respondent: 10727457 / Colin Eke Agent:

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

• I OBJECT to Policy A43a ( Land for North facing slip roads to/from A3 at send Marsh/Burnt Common) This would necessitate a 4-way junction at Burnt Common and would inevitably increase the amount of traffic using the local roads in Send. This junction would worsen the problem of drivers using Send as a cut through from Guildford to Woking on local roads that are just not intended for this purpose.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5292 Respondent: 10727489 / Gaynor Eke Agent:

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

• I OBJECT to Policy A43a ( Land for North facing slip roads to/from A3 at send Marsh/Burnt Common) This would necessitate a 4-way junction at Burnt Common and would inevitably increase the amount of traffic using the local roads in Send. This junction would worsen the problem of drivers using Send as a cut through from Guildford to Woking on local roads that are just not intended for this purpose.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
• I OBJECT to Policy A43a (Land for North facing slip roads to/from A3 at send Marsh/Burnt Common) This would necessitate a 4-way junction at Burnt Common and would inevitably increase the amount of traffic using the local roads in Send. This junction would worsen the problem of drivers using Send as a cut through from Guildford to Woking on local roads that are just not intended for this purpose.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3988  Respondent: 10728321 / Michael Randles  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO the proposed massive new road junction which would increase large traffic in the already congested Send Road and surrounding minor roads. I have seen large lorries with their wheels on part of the narrow footpath in Send Road due to the lack of room to accommodate their size on one side of the road. All the access roads to this site are narrow. There is already access to 1 the A3 road in the London direction provided at Burpham, and traffic from the Woking area can access this by the Woking Road which is wide enough to take large vehicles. Send Road only leads into the tiny mini-roundabout at Old Woking High Street – a junction of even smaller roads.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3374  Respondent: 10728481 / Patricia Ray  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3. I OBJECT to the proposed interchange with the A3 at Garlic's Arch

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2917  Respondent: 10728993 / Gill Love  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to new sites like Garlick's Arch being introduced as an afterthought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A 3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPS16/1291  Respondent: 10731233 / Linda Aris  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the creation of new A3 slip roads at Burntcommon, it will cause huge traffic problems in the area.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4159  Respondent: 10731265 / Liz Turner  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This proposal would encourage additional traffic along the very narrow, winding A247 Clandon Road and the Send Barns Lane/Send Road leading to Woking, the traffic along both of which are already at capacity. There is no scope to widen Send Road or Clandon Road and would lead 10 major congestion and gridlock.

The offer of land to create these slip roads is no more than a bribe by the developer to allow the Garlicks Arch development proposal, both of which should have been dismissed by G.B.C before the Plan was put out to consultation.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5440  Respondent: 10731329 / Sheila Hookins  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5795  Respondent: 10731361 / Joan Bagnall  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Fourthly, I object to the proposed interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common which would encourage traffic to leave the A3 to travel to Woking through Send village. This road struggles to cope with the volume of traffic which it currently does, including huge lorries. The narrow roads of Send Marsh already suffer as a result of a rat runs and lorries using their SAT NAV equipment.

I ask you to urgently reconsider this proposal.

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

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

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3870  Respondent: 10732193 / Leslie Bowerman  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed new A3 traffic interchange at Burnt Common because it would be disastrous for the village of Send in that all traffic from London and the M25 to Woking would go along the already overloaded A247 through the residential heart of Send past the village school which is about to be doubled in size with all the traffic that that implies. This is a semi-rural area and I object to it being converted into a huge motorway-type junction.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4430  Respondent: 10733121 / F. Buchhaus  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to:-

The planned A3 interchange at Burnt Common which will turn Send road into a rat run to Woking

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1682  Respondent: 10733665 / David Elvey  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the proposed new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common (Policy A43a) because it will greatly increase traffic along the A247 and will cause considerable congestion and gridlock at Burnt common and in Send in peak periods.

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

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6134</th>
<th>Respondent: 10734113 / A.H. Finn</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the proposed new interchange with the A3. With the proposed 2000 new houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 house’s at Gosden Hill Burpham and 1800 at Blackwell Farm at Blackwell Farm. Such large developments it will cause a large volume of traffic through Send Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I REQUEST THAT MY COMMENTS ARE SHOWN TO Planning Inspector who will decide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6833</th>
<th>Respondent: 10735777 / S. May</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3443</th>
<th>Respondent: 10736545 / Patricia Midson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A new interchange at the A3 Burn Common is too awful to contemplate. You are just going to wipe Send Village into oblivion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment ID: PSLPS16/507  Respondent: 10741793 / Dianne Mathie  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because it would be disastrous for Send and the (A247) would be gridlocked all day. Send is already gridlocked at key times during the day and simply cannot cope with any more traffic at all.

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25. I moved to Send because I have asthma sufferers in my family and extra pillion would seriously detriment their health.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1566  Respondent: 10742753 / Debbie Leane  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. Consequently it would be our village which would have to bear the brunt of increased traffic from the proposed 200 new houses at Wisley airfield, 2000 new houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm, as vehicles travel to and from the A3, M25, Woking and Guildford. As I stated before, Send Road is already incredibly busy, particularly during the rush hour. Increasing the volume of traffic along this road will only end in gridlock, and as a result the levels of noise and air pollution will get worse. Current levels are too high, and therefore such a development must not be allowed to go ahead.

I request that my comments are shown to the Planning inspector.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/133  Respondent: 10746209 / Pauline Fava  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

-The proposed slip road on to the A3 will add to congestion on local roads. Some of which are barely wide enough for two cars.

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

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1673</th>
<th>Respondent: 10750337 / Veronica Kean</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to a new interchange at Burnt Common because Send would have to take even more traffic from the proposed houses at Wisley Airfield. Send Road is already overloaded and would become grid locked.</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3258</th>
<th>Respondent: 10750945 / Lorna Crispin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43a (New A3 entry slip-road towards Kingston/London, and new A3 exit slip-road from Kingston/London) This would create congestion and heavy traffic through Send Village at peak times, as it is an accident or breakdown on the main arteries causes congestion all around the area of Send and Ripley. This proposed Policy would add extra pressure to the road network, create unacceptable levels of noise, pollution, put residents and children (all now accessing Send School off the main road ) at greater risk this and this is unacceptable.</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3176</th>
<th>Respondent: 10756449 / Richard and Valerie Overton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a) North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved.</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2791</th>
<th>Respondent: 10756545 / Cornelius Griffin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5/ I object to the proposed A3 on/off slip at Burnt common, as a means of advancing large developments. This and the above site indicate a rather disingenuous responses at a public meeting with councillors held in Ripley.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7055  Respondent: 10757185 / Liz George  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

New interchange at A3 at Burnt Common = 5 Individual Objections

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2276  Respondent: 10758593 / Richard & Delia Baker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common.

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of 'through' traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4100  Respondent: 10764385 / E.E Whearley  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the proposed on/off ramp to A3 at Burnt Common as both Ripley and Send would be even more congested and became traffic 'Rat runs'
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/18  Respondent: 10774817 / Jack Aboe  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to this proposal on the grounds that it will significantly increase the traffic flow through Send village which, at rush hour times, is already significant.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2395  Respondent: 10775137 / Wendy Lodge  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to plans for a 4-way interchange at Burnt Common for several reasons. There is no need to build over Green Belt land to provide this interchange. If this junction was developed it would result in a huge increase in traffic through Send on the A247. The road is already struggling with traffic at peak times and this is only going to get worse when the new schools open in Send Barns Lane. Increased traffic through the village will probably result in calls by groups to restrict parking to allow traffic flow, further impinging on residents of Send and detrimental to local businesses. As a resident living on the A247, I object in the strongest terms to this development which would make our lives intolerable and if the 2,000 houses proposed for both Wisley and Burpham go ahead it will only increase traffic further.

I object to this proposal as Government guidance to planners was that Green Belt should only be built on if there are exceptional circumstances requiring this to happen. There are no exceptional circumstances at Garlick's Arch.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1053  Respondent: 10776033 / Prue Robinson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object most strongly to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25. This would be disastrous for Send and the A247 would be gridlocked all day; just please visit this area during any of the rush hours to understand the significant weight of traffic that already uses the A247 and the minor surrounding roads. The knock on effect up to the small roundabout at Old Woking (where the B382 joins it) will be a really serious problem.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4976  Respondent: 10780929 / Naren Nanda  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of 'through' traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7230  Respondent: 10784769 / Jane Baker  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to policy A43.30 the development of new four way interchange onto the A3 which would mean that narrow Send Road (A247) would be the main route for traffic leaving the M25 and A3. It is already crowded and vulnerable to traffic jams. Further traffic from this development would result in permanent gridlock. It simply would not work.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1606  Respondent: 10793281 / Paul Woodington  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to policy A43.30 the development of new four way interchange onto the A3 which would mean that narrow Send Road (A247) would be the main route for traffic leaving the M25 and A3. It is already crowded and vulnerable to traffic jams. Further traffic from this development would result in permanent gridlock. It simply would not work.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3310  **Respondent:** 10798369 / Gail Hollis  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to the new interchange on the A3 with Burnt Common because Send would have to take the traffic from the proposed 2000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm. Much of this traffic to and from the A3, M25, Woking and Guildford would go through Send. Send Barns Lane and Send Road are already overloaded, and quite often gridlocked during the morning and evening peak hours. This is would make this road impossible and would increase pollution and noise levels, which are already excessive. This must be avoided.

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

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7938  **Respondent:** 10799425 / Guildford Greenbelt Group (Susan Parker)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

We object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a). The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities.

There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send.

Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Clandon and Burnt Common.

This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

We object to the proposed Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C). The Infrastructure Schedule sets out the key infrastructure requirements on which the delivery of the plan depends. For each of the Key Allocated Sites in the borough it identifies infrastructure projects that are required, except for Garlick’s Arch (A43) which is not mentioned. It is clear that the Plan takes no account of the infrastructure required for this site and is therefore not fit for purpose.

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

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6405  **Respondent:** 10800065 / David Thompson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6407  Respondent: 10800065 / David Thompson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the employment strategy and impact on Garlicks Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)

The development will result in the loss of existing local successful businesses, which have been employing local people over many decades, and are therefore sustainable.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2616  Respondent: 10800673 / Nigel Rowland  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

• I OBJECT to Policy A43a (Land for North facing slip roads to/from A3 at send Marsh/Burnt Common) This would necessitate a 4-way junction at Burnt Common and would inevitably increase the amount of traffic using the local roads in Send. This junction would worsen the problem of drivers using Send as a cut through from Guildford to Woking on local roads that are just not intended for this purpose. As a resident, I am amazed that there hasn’t yet been a serious accident as drivers use Potters Lane for just this purpose with little regard for the 30mph speed limit.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7500  Respondent: 10800673 / Nigel Rowland  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

• I OBJECT to Policy A43a (Land for North facing slip roads to/from A3 at send Marsh/Burnt Common) This would necessitate a 4-way junction at Burnt Common and would inevitably increase the amount of traffic using the local roads in Send. This junction would worsen the problem of drivers using Send as a cut through from...
Guildford to Woking on local roads that are just not intended for this purpose. As a resident, I am amazed that there hasn’t yet been a serious accident as drivers use Potters Lane for just this purpose with little regard for the 30mph speed limit.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1272  **Respondent:** 10803009 / M Robson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to Policy A43a - the building of new North facing slip roads to/from A3 Send Marsh/Burnt Common.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3473  **Respondent:** 10803297 / John Collomosse  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object on grounds of local traffic congestion to the development of the A3 junction at Garlick’s Arch

I object that you are proposing to build an A3 junction at Send / Burnt Common due to a further 400 housing plus industrial estate being planned for Garlicks Arch. But this will do nothing for all of the 2100 houses who will send their ~2000 cars south through the village of Ripley on their commute to Guildford. Indeed it will attract traffic through Ripley where congestion is already a massive problem in the mornings as people use Ripley as a cut-through from the M25 to Woking. You will not see just a slight increase in congestion, literally the route will be at a standstill unusable for this Wisley housing.

It seems to me that the choice to site the junction at Garlick’s Arch is opportunistic – not strategic. Free land to build the junction has been offered by the farmer land-owner in return for him being allowed to sell his land to build the 400 houses. Surely the better strategic option would have been to build the junction near the 2100 new houses at Ockham, not near the 400 houses at Send? It seems a no brainer.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5796  **Respondent:** 10805537 / Robert Mote  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

Why to we need an additional north entry ramp for the A3 at Burnt Common when there is a perfectly adequate entry ramp in Ripley?

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6064</th>
<th>Respondent: 10805537 / Robert Mote</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why do we need an additional north entry ramp for the A3 at Burnt Common when there is a perfectly adequate entry ramp in Ripley? This will only exacerbate the traffic issues that will be created by the massive house increase within the Send and Ripley areas. Furthermore there has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6078</th>
<th>Respondent: 10805537 / Robert Mote</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4174</th>
<th>Respondent: 10805889 / Bernard Corrigan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. This would result in Send taking traffic from the proposed 2,000 new houses at Wisley, 2,000 houses at Gosden Hill and 1,850 at Blackwell Farm. Most of this new traffic to and from Woking/Guildford and A3/M25 would go through Send. Send Road, which is already over crowded would be gridlocked, and there would be the accompanying increase in pollution, which is already at excessive levels.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPS16/643  Respondent: 10807745 / Belinda Middleton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

2) I object to the new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common (A43a) as it would cause huge traffic problems through Send and Clandon. The current roads are not wide enough for this volume of traffic, it is difficult currently to pass for large lorries and the road is not of sufficient quality to withstand the current traffic, let alone any increase. These roads are regularly used by large quantities of cyclists accessing the Surrey Hills, and in areas there is no pavement. There are two primary schools on these roads (Send and Clandon) and it would be exceptionally dangerous to increase the volume of traffic along these roads where children are crossing regularly.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6312  Respondent: 10807969 / Sarra Martin  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the new interchange, for my reasons stated above.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6040  Respondent: 10811681 / Linda Knight  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

5. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/372  Respondent: 10815681 / Penelope Corlett  Agent:
5. Policy A43a. I object to the land proposed for slip roads to and from the A3 at Send Marsh/ Burnt Common. This would add to the gridlock on the A3 at peak times which is already a major problem. The approach roads of Send Road and the West Clandon road are already congested and could not cope with any more through traffic at peak times. This would become a major access point to the A3 from Woking and the roads and infrastructure are totally inadequate.

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

Attached documents:
1. I OBJECT to the proposed new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because of the total traffic gridlock through Send which will definitely result.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7566  Respondent: 10817633 / M Mansbridge  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to the proposed new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because of the total traffic gridlock through Send which will definitely result.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/516  Respondent: 10818529 / John Hales  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a) with North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved. As someone who can remember as a child hearing nightingales in Clandon which is now replaced by the distant and constant rumble cars this new slip road will blight the area indefinitely and lead to irreparable damage.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/405  Respondent: 10819425 / MP Parrott  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

The proposed 4 way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common to serve this development would be a disaster for Send and Ripley as it would attract additional through traffic from the main conurbation of Woking through the villages heading for the A3 and the M25.

The villages of Send, Send Marsh and Burnt Common are currently not well served by public transport to the main
conurbations of Guildford and Woking and the additional housing, and industrial units will therefore result in a substantial increase in local traffic, air pollution, parking problems, and increased accidents in these villages.

As there are no significant infrastructure improvements described in any detail in the proposal to mitigate the effect of the development sites the proposal presents a significant risk of overloading the current infrastructure in Send.

What impact will the additional traffic have on the surrounding roads in Send and Ripley and on the A3 which is already over capacity at peak times in this area?

This development site will also result in loss of wildlife in this beautiful unspoilt part of Surrey with its diverse bird life.

Have any wildlife and environmental impact assessments been carried out on any of these sites?

What additional facilities are planned to cope with the increased demand for school places, doctors and emergency services from the increase in the population?

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

Attached documents:

I object to the proposed new 4 way A3 junction

The proposed new junction could help parts of the area such as the centre of Ripley, but that benefit is entirely outweighed by the hitherto unimaginable volumes of traffic which would cause gridlock at Burnt Common roundabout as well as on the entire section of A247 from West Clandon to Woking. With these areas gridlocked, traffic would need to find alternative routes and the previously little known lanes around the area would be ruined also. This one singular act of folly would cause immeasurable damage to a wide area.

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

Attached documents:

I object to site A43a the on off ramp at Burnt Common/Clandon as this will increase traffic problems in the villages, not help them.

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

Attached documents:
I object to site A43a the on off ramp at Burnt Common/Clandon as this will increase traffic problems in the villages, not help them.

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

Attached documents:

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

2. I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common – Send Road which is already overloaded would become gridlocked. Send would just become a “cut through” and a “rat run” for traffic to and from the A3, M25 and Woking.

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

Attached documents:
I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common as when there is stationery traffic on the A3 (which is often the case) – traffic trying to join the A3 will back up onto Burnt Common Roundabout and cause major congestion to the connecting roads of Send and down into Ripley.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5927  Respondent: 10828801 / Kathryn Fox  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because it would be disastrous for Send and the (A247) would be gridlocked all day. Noise and pollution levels, already at excessive levels, would worsen.

6. I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6391  Respondent: 10829281 / Kevin Nicholls  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common - the additional traffic from the proposed Wisley; Gosden Hill and Blackwell Farm sites would go through Send and Ripley which are already over loaded and often gridlocked. Noise and pollution levels are already excessive and should not be allowed to increase.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2934  Respondent: 10830753 / AJ Cheeseman  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common.
The proposal is for a new 4-way junction of the A3 at Burnt Common. With a proposal of over 5000 new homes along the A3 at Wisley, Burpham and Blackwell Farm, the new 4-way junction will bring an unprecedented level of traffic through Send which would become gridlocked and create unacceptable levels of air and noise pollution. GBC talk about improvements to the A3 (ref About Guildford, Summer 2016) but is this to the detriment of the villages adjacent to the A3?

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

Attached documents:

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a).

The additional north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

I object to the proposed Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C). The Infrastructure Schedule sets out the key infrastructure requirements on which the delivery of the plan depends. For each of the Key Allocated Sites in the borough it identifies infrastructure projects that are required, except for Garlick’s Arch (A43) which is not mentioned. It is clear that the Plan takes no account of the infrastructure required for this site and is therefore not fit for purpose.

Generally transport evidence for this policy is incomplete and unreliable. What would happen in reality would be serious accidents, major traffic jams twice a day and therefore excessive pollution.

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

Attached documents:
I object to the proposed Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C). The Infrastructure Schedule sets out the key infrastructure requirements on which the delivery of the plan depends. For each of the Key Allocated Sites in the borough it identifies infrastructure projects that are required, except for Garlick’s Arch (A43) which is not mentioned. It is clear that the Plan takes no account of the infrastructure required for this site and is therefore not fit for purpose.

Generally transport evidence for this policy is incomplete and unreliable. What would happen in reality would be serious accidents, major traffic jams twice a day and therefore excessive pollution.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1817  Respondent: 10833537 / AC Vause  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5818  Respondent: 10835617 / Glenis Pycraft  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the 4-way A3 junction at Burnt Common, as Send simply cannot cope with the additional traffic it would bring. Anyone who knows Send village is all too aware of the extreme traffic congestion, especially in the morning and evening rush hours. Traffic already tails back into Woking as traffic travels to and from the A3; the dangers of both gridlock and increased risk of traffic accidents really cannot be overstated.

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

Attached documents:
1. **I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common**

If this plan goes ahead, all the traffic from London/M25 to Woking and back will go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. The proposed extra development in the area will compound this problem. The roads cannot take this sort of traffic, they struggle with current traffic levels. Neither can they be improved/widened because they run through villages.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7494  
Respondent: 10836033 / Katherine Gervasio  
Agent:  

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a  

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

**I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)**

If this plan goes ahead, all the traffic from London/M25 to Woking and back will go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. The proposed extra development in the area will compound this problem. The roads cannot take this sort of traffic, they struggle with current traffic levels. Neither can they be improved/widened because they run through villages.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3381  
Respondent: 10837313 / Mary Jane Gray  
Agent:  

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a  

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

I object to the development proposed under Policy A43A. Construction of a new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common will impose an intolerable burden on the A247 through Send and West Clandon as this road will now become a primary feeder to the A3 and hence the M25. The existing roads though these villages cannot be widened or upgraded and are already overloaded at peak times so any further increase in traffic flows will produce a gridlock situation.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2498  
Respondent: 10839073 / Annie Hutchison  
Agent:  

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a  

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

I object to the development proposed under Policy A43A. Construction of a new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common will impose an intolerable burden on the A247 through Send and West Clandon as this road will now become a primary feeder to the A3 and hence the M25. The existing roads though these villages cannot be widened or upgraded and are already overloaded at peak times so any further increase in traffic flows will produce a gridlock situation.

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

Attached documents:
I object to the new A3 interchange at Burnt Common. The roads around Send are already congested: already at peak times it is difficult to safely turn out of Boughton Hall Avenue onto the Portsmouth Road, and the proposed development is likely to result in near-permanent gridlock at Burnt Common. In addition, the road through Clandon is unsuitable for large vehicles: I have seen several "near misses" as lorries come round narrow bends straddling the middle of the road. The inevitable increase in commercial traffic would make these roads far more dangerous.

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

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1574</th>
<th>Respondent: 10840769 / Rosemarie Haxton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong>  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to <strong>Policy A43.30</strong> the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because it would be disastrous for Send and the (A247) would be gridlocked all day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2688</th>
<th>Respondent: 10843585 / Jackie Payne</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong>  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) I OBJECT to policy A43.30 the development of new four way interchange onto the A3 which would mean that narrow Send Road (A247) would be the main route for traffic leaving the M25 and A3. It is already crowded and vulnerable to traffic jams. Further traffic from this development would result in permanent gridlock. It simply would not work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7553</th>
<th>Respondent: 10843585 / Jackie Payne</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong>  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to the new interchange idea with the A3 at Burnt Common. Send would have to cope with even more traffic and it is very busy already. Send Road would just become gridlocked. Pollution levels and noise would become much worse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comment ID: PSLPS16/4872  Respondent: 10844609 / Sam Critchlow  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

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

Attached documents:

---

### Comment ID: PSLPS16/7665  Respondent: 10844993 / Simon Wright  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a).

The additional north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

I object to the proposed Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C). The Infrastructure Schedule sets out the key infrastructure requirements on which the delivery of the plan depends. For each of the Key Allocated Sites in the borough it identifies infrastructure projects that are required, except for Garlick’s Arch (A43) which is not mentioned. It is clear that the Plan takes no account of the infrastructure required for this site and is therefore not fit for purpose.

Generally transport evidence for this policy is incomplete and unreliable. What would happen in reality would be serious accidents, major traffic jams twice a day and therefore excessive pollution.

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

Attached documents:

---

### Comment ID: PSLPS16/6773  Respondent: 10846625 / Frank Drennan  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

1.1 **I object** to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a). The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.
1.2 The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved and are already heavily loaded.

1.3 I object to the proposed Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C). The Infrastructure Schedule sets out the key infrastructure requirements on which the delivery of the plan depends. For each of the Key Allocated Sites in the borough it identifies infrastructure projects that are required, except for Garlick’s Arch (A43) which is not mentioned. It is clear that the Plan takes no account of the infrastructure required for this site and is therefore not fit for purpose.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/870  Respondent: 10848513 / Martin Cole  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

5. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

Ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for the local population, who do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition of ramps will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. e.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as these roads cannot be improved. The queues during the rush hours are such that it already brings gridlock to the local area. Encouraging more traffic to use these roads would be untenable.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6442  Respondent: 10848577 / Jen Dunbar  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because Send would have to take traffic from the proposed 2000 new houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm. Send is already congested and any increase in traffic would cause gridlock and cause significant increase in pollution and noise which would negatively affect residents and wildlife.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/198  Respondent: 10849377 / Vickie Leonard  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to site A43a the on and off ramp at Clordon, this will only increase traffic in the village not help us at all.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6315  Respondent: 10849697 / Audrey Moore  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to the new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because all the traffic from the proposed 2000 new houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 at Burpham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm would have to be taken by SEND Send Road, which is already overloaded, would become gridlocked along with noise and pollution levels which are excessive already, would worsen.

I trust you will take all these OBJECTIONS into account.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/377  Respondent: 10851745 / Natalie Green  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

A43a

I strongly object to the provision of a new north facing slip road.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3558  Respondent: 10852289 / Barry Scott  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to plan A43A a new northbound slip road to the A3 from Clordon Road and a new southbound off slip from the A3 to A247. The proposal to create extra entry and exit slip roads from the A3, London bound, off the A247 Clordon Road will add grossly to the congestion that is already a big problem at the roundabout and surrounding roads in Send at rush hour.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPS16/1836  Respondent: 10852801 / Carolyn Hart  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because Send would have to take traffic from the proposed new houses at Wisley airfield, Gosden Hill at Burpham and Blackwell Farm. Much of the traffic from the A3, M25 Woking and Guildford would go through Send. Send Road and Clandon Road are already overloaded with traffic and would become gridlocked. Currently I can sit for ages trying to get out of my entrance on to the Clandon Road if this interchange were to go ahead it would be impossible. Noise and pollution levels which are already excessive would get worse. This would be a disaster.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6242  Respondent: 10855297 / Susan Mansbridge  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 this will cause congestion on the main road right through Send village. Every time the A3 has a traffic problem our road is nose to tail often as far as the Old Woking mini-roundabout, that is a mile and a half of solid traffic. The knock on effect of too much traffic means, Potter’s Lane and Send Marsh Road have the same problem.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1109  Respondent: 10855553 / Emma Tallick  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

5. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved.

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

Attached documents:
I object to the new junction at Burnt Common as it would gridlock Send through to Old Woking even more than it is now. Twice a day its a nightmare.

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

Attached documents:

I object to the 4 way ramp to A3 at Burnt Common as it will accommodate the 7000 homes but will cause no end of chaos to our local road network.

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

Attached documents:

I OBJECT to the interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common.

This will cause additional traffic congestion to an area which even now cannot at times cope with the volume of traffic and is often gridlocked.

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

Attached documents:

The propose A3 on ramp will only increase traffic through an already over used village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I OBJECT to this proposed new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because much of the traffic to and from the A3, the M25, Woking and Guildford would be going through to Send Road which is already at full capacity. It would be total gridlock as this road funnels into a small roundabout and very small congested roads in Old Woking.

The proposed junction would have to take traffic from the proposed 2000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm, this would be a total disaster for the Village of Send.

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

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a). The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

I object to the proposed Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C). The Infrastructure Schedule sets out the key infrastructure requirements on which the delivery of the plan depends. For each of the Key Allocated Sites in the borough it identifies infrastructure projects that are required, except for Garlick’s Arch (A43) which is not mentioned. It is clear that the Plan takes no account of the infrastructure required for this site and is therefore not fit for purpose.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
5) I OBJECT to policy A43.30 the development of new four way interchange onto the A3 which would mean that narrow Send Road (A247) would be the main route for traffic leaving the M25 and A3. It is already crowded and vulnerable to traffic jams. Further traffic from this development would result in permanent gridlock. It simply would not work.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4483  Respondent: 10859489 / Jennifer Procter  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

Garlick's Arch, Burnt Common

Proposed Interchange on the A3

I object to this policy because it will significantly increase traffic flow through Send. This is already at a standstill at peak hours and this will meant gridlock. The narrow through road with no capacity for widening means that there will be increased danger to cyclists and pedestrians and a further reduction in already polluted air quality.

I object to this policy because there has been no adequate transport assessment and the supporting evidence is sketchy, incomplete and unreliable.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6399  Respondent: 10859873 / Mat Clark  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to interchange at A3 Burnt Common. Overloaded roads, and noise and air pollution.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6616  Respondent: 10864065 / Alec Mcindoe  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the proposed new 4 way on/off ramp to A3 at Burnt Common. I am a regular user of the road through West Clandon and there is already a serious problem with heavy goods vehicles and buses/coaches using the road. The proposed new junctions would create even more commercial traffic accessing the A3. I am particularly concerned about the danger to children and parents delivering and collecting from Clandon School. At times, heavy vehicles can only proceed by mounting the pavement!

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/780</th>
<th>Respondent: 10865537 / Edwina Fassom</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)</td>
<td>The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/568</th>
<th>Respondent: 10866305 / Christine Reeves</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) I Object site A43a the on and off ramp at Clandon as this will increase traffic which is bad enough as it is, for the environment and local residents in the Villages already</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1894</th>
<th>Respondent: 10866945 / Kristine Good</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to a new interchange for the A3 at Burnt Common. This is because the local roads connecting from there through Send to Woking are unable to cope with current traffic flow at peak times, increased traffic will not be able to be accommodated. Send Barns Lane, Send Road, Broadmeads, will be constantly gridlocked as this is frequently illustrated when any form of road works takes place between Burnt Common and Old Woking. This increased volume of traffic will lead to excessive and unreasonable levels of noise and pollution.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6414</th>
<th>Respondent: 10867009 / Paul Good</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to a new interchange for the A3 at Burnt Common. This is because the local roads connecting from there through Send to Woking are unable to cope with current traffic flow at peak times, increased traffic will not be able to be accommodated. Send Barns Lane, Send Road, Broadmeads, will be constantly gridlocked as this is frequently illustrated when any form of road works takes place between Burnt Common and Old Woking. This increased volume of traffic will lead to excessive and unreasonable levels of noise and pollution.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6280</th>
<th>Respondent: 10867105 / Steve Loosley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5773</th>
<th>Respondent: 10868609 / Robert Lockie</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- I object to the 4way interchange proposed for the A3 at Burnt Common with the above problem and 2,000 houses at Wisley and 2,000 houses at Burpham, Send could not cope. Added to this is 1850 homes at Blackwell Farm which would also add to this.
• I object to the 4way interchange proposed for the A3 at Burnt Common as (added to the above) noise and pollution levels which are already at excessive levels, would be far worse.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5774  Respondent: 10868609 / Robert Lockie  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• I object to the fact that no real guarantee has will made that the proposed new junction with the A3 would be built BEFORE housing and increased industrial traffic. There is no workable proposal in the draft local plan that this would happen. The wording would give developers ways of building without this being done if planning permission in the proposed local plan was granted – they would have ways of wheedling out of road building. There is no real guarantee to councillors stating at the meeting in Send that ‘if infrastructure does not happen then housing will not happen’.
• I object to the proposed junction new A3 junction at Burnt Common as no funding has been guaranteed for this and the money for this would NOT come from GBC. At the time of the issuing of the draft proposal, significant talks had not taken place with Surrey CC/ Highway England etc so there is no guarantee they would agree to fund this and no guarantee of a time frame for funding.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6636  Respondent: 10869729 / Ralph Clark  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I also strongly object to the ridiculous proposal (A43a) of a new on/off slip road for the A3 at Burnt Common on a number of grounds:

1. The destruction of Green Belt land this proposal will use; including mature Oak woodland which is important for local wildlife.
2. The fact that the north-bound access will join an already busy section of the A3 particularly during the rush hour, with the potential of an increased risk of accidents as the traffic joins the A3 flow.
3. Access from Send Marsh Road to the B2215 can be difficult enough during peak times as traffic comes off the A3 using the B2215 as a ‘rat run’ to re-join the A3 at Ripley.
4. The A3 corridor is such a busy route already so further development anywhere along its length is a ridiculous proposal.

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

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/3546  Respondent: 10869985 / Alan Blackburn  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

Interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because Send would then have the traffic from 2000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill and 1850 at Blackwell Farm.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3547  Respondent: 10870593 / Maureen Blackburn  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

Interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because Send would then have the traffic from 2000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill and 1850 at Blackwell Farm.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7568  Respondent: 10872353 / Robin Williams  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

1. I OBJECT to the new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. This will inevitably increase the traffic, pollution etc inSend Road. We have already experienced on a couple of occasion in recent years when other local road repairs have forced traffic to use Send Road how severe these problems can/will be

The proposed developments will destroy the fabric of Send, and hence my strong objections to all of them.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7478  Respondent: 10873313 / Rob Stevens  Agent:
I object to a new interchange at Burnt Common and the insane impact this would have on our already heavily traffic affected village. Traffic would be even worse and with the other proposed developments at Wisley Airfield and Burpham we would just see more and more traffic with cars for the approx 4000 homes using the roads.

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

Attached documents:

---

I object to the new 4-way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common which would have disastrous effect on the traffic in Send and Ripley which is already congested and used as a cut through from Woking to the A3.

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

Attached documents:

---

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic fr

[Note: text was incomplete when received]

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

Attached documents:

---

The creation of new north and southbound slip roads to and from the A3 to the A247 Clandon Road (Policy A43A) at Burnt Common. Congestion already occurs on Send Road (A247) in the core hours of the day. Send would become the
through route to Woking for traffic leaving the M25 and A3 as well as for vehicles coming from proposed housing developments in Wisley and Burpham (2,000 houses in each case).

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3919  Respondent: 10878081 / Linda June Turner  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. New north and south bound slip-roads to and from the A3 to the A 247 Clandon Road

Where the traffic is already causing problems and any problem on the A3 and the Guildford area creates total gridlock. This scheme would encourage more traffic to use the Send and Clandon roads to access the A3 and these roads are already at their full capacity.

There is no scope for widening roads in this area. The proposed housing would add another 1,000 cars and other is heavy traffic. This junction will not case the traffic problem in and around Guildford but drastically add to it. G.B.C. have inserted this late scheme to aid development at Gosden Hill Farm and the former Wisley airport. This will be the beginning of major urban sprawl development.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3082  Respondent: 10878433 / John Townsend  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

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

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

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7010  Respondent: 10878561 / Amy Dowsett  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
A 43a The proposed Northbound and Southbound slip roads

I strongly object to the proposed northbound and southbound slip roads on the A3 as our roads are already congested for much of the day. The amount of lorries and other commercial traffic that already thunders through our village on the A247 is bad enough now. There are problems with speeding, pollution and no safe crossing points. The proposed slip roads would increase this tenfold. The road is bordered on both sides by housing, businesses, side roads, a recreation ground and the primary school. Why are the children and adults of Send less important than in other parts of the Guildford area?

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3837  Respondent: 10878657 / Ann Dowsett  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the proposed northbound and southbound slip roads on the A3 as our roads are already congested for much of the day. The amount of lorries and other commercial traffic that already thunders through our village on the A247 is bad enough now. There are problems with speeding, pollution and no safe crossing points. The proposed slip roads would increase this tenfold. The road is bordered on both sides by housing, businesses, side roads, a recreation ground and the primary school. Why are the children and adults of Send less important than in other parts of the Guildford area?

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5555  Respondent: 10878977 / Lisbet Hjort Jensen  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/3024  Respondent: 10879457 / Louisa Scott  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to plan A43A a new northbound slip road to the A3 from Clandon Road and a new southbound off slip from the A3 to A247. The proposal to create extra entry and exit slip roads from the A3, London bound, off the A247 Clandon Road will add grossly to the congestion that is already a big problem at the roundabout and surrounding roads in Send at rush hour.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6544  Respondent: 10880481 / James Anderson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

interchange at Burnt Common this will choke Send Road and the Village with additional traffic to and from Woking. This will create a new rat run into Woking from the A3 and the M25. Send Road will also have to contend with the additional traffic from the proposed 2000 houses at Wisley, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill and the 1850 houses at Blackwell farm. This on a road that is already heavily congested.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6610  Respondent: 10880481 / James Anderson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. My previous points already highlight the fact that Send Road is heavily congested especially at peak times Noise and pollution levels, already extremely high, would become much worse! By creating a new interchange at Burnt Common this will choke Send Road and the Village with additional traffic to and from Woking. This route through Send is likely to become a rat run to Woking from the A3 & M25 and in addition would have to contend with additional traffic from the proposed 2000 houses at Wisley, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill and 1850 houses at Blackwell farm.

I trust you will consider the above comments and those of all the other residents in Send and the surrounding villages who feel strongly about the proposals and wish to preserve their communities.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7433  Respondent: 10880609 / S. Groves  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. My previous points already highlight the fact that Send Road is heavily congested especially at peak times Noise and pollution levels, already extremely high, would become much worse! By creating a new interchange at Burnt Common this will choke Send Road and the Village with additional traffic to and from Woking. This route through Send is likely to become a rat run to Woking from the A3 & M25 and in addition would have to contend with additional traffic from the proposed 2000 houses at Wisley, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill and 1850 houses at Blackwell farm.

I trust you will consider the above comments and those of all the other residents in Send and the surrounding villages who feel strongly about the proposals and wish to preserve their communities.

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

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6351</th>
<th>Respondent: 10881217 / Ben Stevens</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

I OBJECT to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. Send would need to accommodate the traffic for the proposed 2000 new houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 new houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham as well as the 1850 proposed new houses at Blackwell Farm. Much of the traffic between these sites, the A3 and M25 would need to pass through the already congested roads in Send and Send Marsh, which are already overloaded with existing local traffic. Noise and pollution levels within Send and Send Marsh are already at excessive levels and the proposed interchange would only worsen this situation.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/783</th>
<th>Respondent: 10882785 / Stephen Fleming</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

I also object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because it would be disastrous for Send. The A247 would be permanently gridlocked. The traffic issues we residents face on a daily basis should not be underestimated.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/783</th>
<th>Respondent: 10882785 / Stephen Fleming</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Following the approval of the revised Local Plan by the full council of Guildford Borough Council on 24th May, I would like to make it clear that I object to the provisions set out in the Local Plan as they threaten to destroy the established nature and identity of our villages by building on Green Belt land and will add considerably to the already unacceptable levels of traffic on the A3, A247 and M25 and many other roads in the borough.

In particular, I object on the following basis.

1. I object to the creation of a new 4 way interchange onto the A3 on the A247 (Policy A43A) as this would add to the ever increasing levels of traffic on the A247, A3 and through Send and Clandon. Send would become a through route to and from the A3 and will become gridlocked all day.

2. I object to the impact that Policy A43A will have on the air quality for those living in the surrounding areas and for future generations.
3. I object to the impact on residents that the resulting noise pollution of Policy A43A will have.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/497  Respondent: 10884993 / Dave Fassom  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3147  Respondent: 10889985 / Ruth Macdonald  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The addition of north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2840  Respondent: 10893505 / P J Freeland  Agent:
I OBJECT to a new interchange for the A3 at Burnt common which will result in a massive increase in traffic through Send, causing gridlock, noise and emissions pollution.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6379  Respondent: 10895009 / Holly Broughton  Agent:

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

• I object to the proposal to build a 4 way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common in order to facilitate this development and other nearby developments. This would be disastrous for the local area. Commuters would be drawn to this area and further congest an area that is already badly congested with traffic. It will mean that the narrow Send Road (A247) will be gridlocked all day as would most surrounding roads. Send will be the through route to Woking for traffic leaving the M25 at Junction 10, and the new development of 2,000 houses at Wisley and also the new development of 2,000 houses at Burpham.

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

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

I object to the proposal to build a 4 way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common in order to facilitate this development and other nearby developments. This would be disastrous for the local area. Commuters would be drawn to this area and further congest an area that is already badly congested with traffic. It will mean that the narrow Send Road (A247) will be gridlocked all day as would most surrounding roads. Send will be the through route to Woking for traffic leaving the M25 at Junction 10, and the new development of 2,000 houses at Wisley and also the new development of 2,000 houses at Burpham.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/669  Respondent: 10897217 / Warren Hogben  Agent:

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

1. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of through traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6006  Respondent: 10898113 / V A Lewis  Agent:

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

I object to an interchange at the Garlick’s Arch site. It would lead to a vast amount of traffic gridlocking local roads which are 2-lane and some single track with passing places, some narrow and twisting.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1356  Respondent: 10898721 / J Hawkins  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to site A43a the on and off ramp at Burnt Common/Clandon, this will increase the traffic problems in the
villages not help them. The current status is that the roads are busy for large periods of the day, not just at peak hours and
with many narrow roads and surfaces constantly in need of repair due to the current heavy traffic and extremes of
weather. There are far more vans and lorries using these roads in recent years. This development would only exacerbate
the current problems by hastening the need for road repairs, reducing the available surface area to absorb heavy rainfall
causing flooding as well as reducing the village character of the area – this despite the stated aim of retaining our special
heritage and landscape.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7397  Respondent: 10899137 / Justina Buswell  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

I Object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. Send and Ripley already become gridlocked when there is
an accident on the A3 or M25, which is a frequent occurrence. If the proposed plans for 2000 houses at Wisley Airfield,
2000 houses in Burpham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm go ahead: Send would have to somehow accommodate this traffic.
Noise from the A3/M25 is already excessive, as is air pollution and any increase in traffic would have a hugely
detrimental effect on the local population.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1352  Respondent: 10899233 / Frederick Hookins  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

I object to the building of a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common as this will cause gridlock through Send
which is already grid locked most days.

I would like my comments are shown to the planning inspector who will decide.

I would like a confirmation that my communication has been received by Guildford Council.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5432  Respondent: 10899233 / Frederick Hookins  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )
I object to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7273  Respondent: 10900065 / Jenny and Guy Marshall  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

As a resident of Ripley I write to object to the local plan as the proposed development is not sustainable and I also object to the late inclusion of site A43a Garlicks Arch.

I object to site A43a the on and off ramp at Burnt Common which will only lead to yet more traffic congestion.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7280  Respondent: 10900065 / Jenny and Guy Marshall  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to site A43a the on and off ramp at Burnt Common which will only lead to yet more traffic congestion.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2390  Respondent: 10900609 / Beverley Gear  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to a 4 way interchange on the A3 at Burnt Common as this would be catastrophic for Send as this would be the through route to Woking from the M25 and A3. With additional traffic for the proposed 2000 houses at Wisley and also 2000 at Burpham, Send cannot and must not take this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6601  Respondent: 10902401 / Nick Enderby  Agent:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4225</th>
<th>Respondent: 10903265 / M Stokes</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site A43a - I object to the proposed northbound slip roads. The volume of traffic at present using the A247 is already excessive both morning and evening with extensive traffic queues in both direction on the A247 creating significant pollution and the use of rat runs attempting to avoid the queues. New slip roads can only increase this as traffic attempts to join and leave the A3.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1911</th>
<th>Respondent: 10904865 / Michael W.R. Herwig</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to Policy A43- A3 Interchange at Send Marsh/Hurnt Common. The A247 is already a highly congested road during the peak times with the extra traffic from 400 new homes and warehousing the area will be permanently gridlocked! Added to this the proposed 2000 homes at Gosden Hill and 2000 houses at Wisley Airfield most of the traffic to and fro to the A3, M25, Woking, and Guildford would go through Send. As the A247 is already overloaded noise and pollution levels already at excessive levels would worsen. The A247 cannot be improved due to the nature of this residential road and narrow bridges crossing the Wey and Arun canal and the River Wey. Added to this most of the roads, which join onto the A247, are residential single-track lanes. So where is all the extra traffic supposed to go?</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to the building of a new junction for the A3 at Burnt Common. I have seen the traffic in the area increase in volume drawn by the magnet of the A3 and M25. They have been drawn like flies into the net of the A3, M25 congestion and I am astonished that Guildford Council don't realise that the whole Send area will seize as frustrated drivers scurry about, very slowly of course, in their attempt to get to the A3 and M25.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1692  Respondent: 10905185 / D White  Agent:

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to the destruction of Green Belt at Burnt Common in order to create a further junction for the A3. This proposal will massively increase the traffic along the A247 through both West Clandon and Send. The A247 was never designed to attract large volumes of traffic and is incapable of improvement without substantial compulsory purchase of land and property. I BELIEVE THAT THE LAND HAS BEEN OFFERED BY THE OWNERS OF THE GARLICK ARCH LAND AS A MEANS OF PERSUADING GUILDFORD COUNCIL TO GRANT PERMISSION FOR THE 400 HOUSES AND INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT.

You will be feeding the already seized up A3.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4264  Respondent: 10906145 / Joe Gervasio  Agent:

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

1. **I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)**

North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition would draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This would result in the A247 (Send Road) being gridlocked most of the time.

This is not sustainable as this road cannot be improved, and the fact that there is no concrete proposal in the Local Plan to do so is further evidence of this.

Furthermore, I object to this proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4803  Respondent: 10910369 / Karen Doyle  Agent:
I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5989  Respondent: 10910753 / Heather Thompson  Agent:

North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved.

Ripley High Street and Send Road are already very busy roads which are, at times dangerous to cross. If the Local Plan is adopted in its present form, the potential increase in traffic will also be accompanied by an unacceptable rise in air pollution. This is already excessive in this area with pollution from the A3 and M25.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5648  Respondent: 10911425 / Andrew Gray  Agent:

1. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The proposed 4 way on off ramp at Burnt Common will be used to facilitate the Gosden farm development and justify the building of the Wisley and Clandon developments. What has not been taken into account is the impact of the increased traffic on the already congested country lanes.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6684  Respondent: 10912513 / Sarah Green  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I object to the creation of a new 4 way interchange onto the A3 on the A247 (Policy A43A) as this would add to the ever increasing levels of traffic on the A247, A3 and through Send and Clandon. Send would become a through route to and from the A3 and will become gridlocked all day.
2. I object to the impact that Policy A43A will have on the air quality for those living in the surrounding areas and for future generations.
3. I object to the impact on residents that the resulting noise pollution of Policy A43A will have.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7199  Respondent: 10912513 / Sarah Green  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43A
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the creation of a new 4 way interchange onto the A3 on the A247 (Policy A43A) as this would add to the ever increasing levels of traffic on the A247, A3 and through Send and Clandon. Send would become a through route to and from the A3 and will become gridlocked all day.

1. I object to the impact that Policy A43A will have on the air quality for those living in the surrounding areas and for future generations.

I object to the impact of Policy A43 and A43A on local infrastructure. Congestion levels on A247 are already increasing at an alarming rate and will be further exacerbated by the development of Garlick’s Arch as the residents will have to rely on the use of private cars.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4253  Respondent: 10914849 / Robert Yates  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43A
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common - Send would have to take an increased volume of traffic from the A3 on its already heavily congested roads.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8237  Respondent: 10917089 / Maria Schirmer  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43A
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Site Allocation A43a (Land for new north facing slip roads to/from A3 at Send Marsch, Burnt Common)

**I OBJECT**

Again the objection is due to the hugely increased traffic that will impact the A247 – Send Road; a road that simply cannot cope with any increased traffic volume and increased levels of noise and pollution due to larger traffic volume.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1816  **Respondent:** 10918497 / Darren Moss  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

5/ I OBJECT to a new interchange with the A3 at burnt common because Send would have to take the traffic from proposed developments at Wisley Airfield, Gosden Hill, Burpham and Blackwell Farm. This totals over 4800 houses. Traffic from these developments would use this new interchange creating gridlock in the villages.

Could you please confirm receipt of my objections and I look forward to a positive conclusion to safeguard the villages from these over the top proposals.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/308  **Respondent:** 10919105 / Susan Thompson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to. Site 43a the on /off ramp at Clandon as this will increase traffic problem in the villages

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3804  **Respondent:** 10919841 / J.A. Millard  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I STRONGLY OBJECT to a new interchange for the A3 at Burnt Common. This will be the final death knell for the Send/Ripley area with a huge increase in traffic transiting through an inadequate road system. This is not for the benefit of local residents but rather for self-serving developers. It will massively increase noise and pollution levels and will no doubt further extend the effect of the tarmac desert that is the A3.

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

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4789  Respondent: 10920001 / Jeff Doyle  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7174  Respondent: 10920865 / Sebastian Forbes  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

Also, I'm warmly in favour of sorting out the interchange at Burnt Common and A247 - long overdue. The middle of Ripley would be much clearer - good. But have you considered the knock-on effect on the road from Send? There's no indication that you have.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7680  Respondent: 10921057 / D M Deacon  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

Site A43a - I object to the proposed new northbound slip roads. The volume of traffic at present using the A247 is already excessive both morning and evening with extensive traffic queues in both direction on the A247 creating significant pollution and the use of rat runs attempting to avoid the queues. New slip roads can only increase this as traffic attempts to join and leave the A3.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5852  Respondent: 10921633 / Emma Loosley  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

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

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

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7428  Respondent: 10921921 / V Groves  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. Send would need to accommodate the traffic for the proposed 2000 new houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 new houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham as well as the 1850 proposed new houses at Blackwell Farm. Much of the traffic between these sites, the A3 and M25 would need to pass through the already congested roads in Send and Send Marsh, which are already overloaded with existing local traffic. Noise and pollution levels within Send and Send Marsh are already at excessive levels and the proposed interchange would only worsen this situation.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5958  Respondent: 10922177 / Paul Knight  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6768  Respondent: 10922177 / Paul Knight  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
5. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2825  Respondent: 10922689 / Kathleen Grehan  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

5. New interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common

I strongly object to this development. It can only increase the traffic using Send Road from the A3 and the M25. We cannot tolerate any more traffic jams outside our house. It is already unbearable.

I would like to know if there is any facility for me as a Deaf BSL user to express my concerns to these issues using my own language of BSL? BSL is one of the UK languages. I have had to pay a communication support worker to write this letter for me as I am not comfortable using English.

Please confirm receipt of this letter and also ensure that it is shown to the Planning Inspector responsible for decisions on this matter.

I will be forwarding this letter to my MP.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3016  Respondent: 10922945 / Toby Meredith  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a) as it would cause MAJOR congestion to Send, Ripley and Clandon. These minor roads are already congested at busy times of the day. This proposal would bring a disproportionate amount of through traffic travelling to the A3 and the M25. The roads are not capable of sustaining this increase.

I object to the new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A42a) as the ensuing large amounts of traffic would make the local roads hazardous to the local community due to the lack of paths and cycle lanes. We already have extra cyclists using the small country lanes and roads in this area all the time now since the Olympics and many people visit this area to walk.

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

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7486</th>
<th>Respondent: 10923745 / Marwan Khalek</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. The proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common as the traffic impact on the rest of the road network in Send has not been properly assessed and will result traffic gridlock all through the day.  
2. The proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common. The need and effect has not been properly evidenced and the Transport Evidence provided is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25. | **What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?** | **Attached documents:** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4244</th>
<th>Respondent: 10923873 / Dennis Gordon</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| I object to the 4-way intersection.  
I object to the fact the road infrastructure through Send has not been thought about and the consequences of putting a large interchange on this site would cause gridlock. The amount of traffic this will create through Send is unfeasible as there is only two way street that goes through the centre of the village. | **What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?** | **Attached documents:** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3611</th>
<th>Respondent: 10924769 / Christy Dadswell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to policy A43a proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/818</th>
<th>Respondent: 10924897 / Louis Botha</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Section page number  
Page 111 of 350  
Document page number  
112
Site A43A and A43B – Burnt Common interchange:

I object to the proposed interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common. The interchange will cause the A247 to become a through-road between Woking and the M25. Send is building a new primary school on that particular stretch of the A247. Creating the new interchange, together with the additional school traffic, will cause immediate and virtually permanent gridlock on the A247, which would severely damage village life.

I object to the fact that this site was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously. Full consultation is required.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3368  Respondent: 10925217 / AW Winterborne  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at burnt common because Send would have to take the traffic load from the a3/m25 woking and guildford, pollutant levels are already exceeding the limit with the current load but having more would just make the area toxic.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6531  Respondent: 10925409 / Tina Higgins  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The creation of ramps to and from the A3 at Garlick’s Arch / Burnt Common (A43A) would exacerbate local traffic problems on roads which already cannot support the existing volume of traffic. The new ramps would generate significant additional flows upon local roads creating numerous rat runs as commuters strive to save additional time. This pressure would not just be felt by the A247 but by narrow lanes e.g. those around East Clandon and Tithebarns Lane in Send.

- The Local Plan seeks to direct additional traffic onto roads (A247) which cannot be widened to accommodate the additional volume of traffic
- The creation of the ramps to and from the A3 at Garlick’s Arch / Burnt Common would generate additional noise to Local houses whilst significantly deteriorating the quality of air
- These ramps would generate significant safety risks to those living in the immediate vicinity of the planned ramps (Tithebarns Lane) together with pedestrians, cyclists and other users of Tithebarns Lane – including staff and visitors to HMP Send.
- The Local Plan which includes 400 houses and 7,000 sq feet of industrial usage (A43) in an area where only recently you correctly turned down an application for only 25 houses. Housing Need is not an exceptional circumstance which justifies the removal of land from the Green Belt. Simply because a Landowner and a Developer are seeking to make millions of pounds profit – that greed is not an exceptional circumstance which justifies the removal of land from the Green Belt. Neither is there an exception circumstance justified when those said Land owners and developers effectively offer a bribe of paying for the ramps to the A3 (A43A). On
every moral and ethical test this is not something which can be justified and should be removed from the Local Plan.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5830  Respondent: 10927553 / Marion Harris  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed new interchange on the A3 at Burntcommon. The local roads already have queues on a frequent basis and cannot hope to cope with the additional traffic such an interchange would generate.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1776  Respondent: 10928769 / John Slatford  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Provision of slip roads at Burnt Common is a Highways England matter not Guildford Borough Council.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4950  Respondent: 10930081 / Helen Court  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

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

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5694  Respondent: 10930945 / Peter Perry  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)
North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. Whilst some locals might benefit from this access the A3 to the north, the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. (E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking). This is not sustainable as these roads are already overloaded with no scope to be improved.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6958  Respondent: 10930945 / Peter Perry  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)
North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. Whilst some locals might benefit from this access the A3 to the north, the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. (E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking). This is not sustainable as these roads are already overloaded with no scope to be improved.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7387  Respondent: 10934689 / Adam Fox  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because it would be disastrous for Send and the (A247) would be gridlocked all day. Noise and pollution levels, already at excessive levels, would worsen.

6. I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2417  Respondent: 10935009 / Richard Winton  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to the north facing slip road allocation A43a

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4125  Respondent: 10935137 / Jack Winton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to north facing slip road allocation

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7327  Respondent: 10936929 / William McGowan  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. This will have little effect on the traffic flow in the area in terms of dissipating congestion which at peak hours often extends from the A3 through Ripley and up to the roundabout at the Shell petrol station in Send. Similarly, traffic travelling in a south-easterly directions towards said roundabout frequently extends all of the way through Send village to the New Inn. It is worth noting that much of the traffic that passes through these areas does not necessarily originate in the Send area but instead in Guildford or Woking, representing the importance of this area as a thoroughfare for vehicular traffic. Currently this traffic experiences frequent roadworks and temporary traffic lights, increasing journey times year upon year. One can only imagine the congestion that will result if 400 homes are built at Garlick’s Arch, 45 houses are built at Clockbarn Nursery, 40 houses are built at Send Hill, 2000 houses are built at Wisley Airfield, 200 houses are built at Gosden Hill and 1850 houses are built at Blackwell Farm. Much of the traffic from surrounding areas would travel through Send. Noise and pollution levels would rise and degrade residents’ amenity.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5839  Respondent: 10937025 / Louise McGowan  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to the new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence in the Plan is incomplete and untested but it clearly follows that with 2000 new homes proposed for Wisley Airfield, 2000 at Gosden Hill Burpham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm, much of the traffic as a result of this development would need to travel
through Send Road which is already heavily congested and has got significantly worse over the last 16 years that I have lived in Send.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6757  Respondent: 10938241 / Alan Brockbank  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the proposed interchange at Burnt Common. The Send road is not equipped to take the extra traffic.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4416  Respondent: 10940673 / Carolyn Davis  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common (A43a) because Send and Clandon would have to take traffic from the proposed 2,000 new houses at Wisley Airfield, 2,000 houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham and 1,850 at Blackwell Farm. Much of this traffic to and fro the A3, M25, Woking and Guildford would go through Send. Send Road, which is already overloaded, would become gridlocked as would Ripley which is used as a rat-run if there is traffic congestion on the A3. Noise and pollution levels, already at excessive levels, would worsen.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6207  Respondent: 10940833 / Natasha Taylor  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/offramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition of north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Cormman would be a significant negative impact for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of 'through' traffic.
The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to these areas on small roads which cannot be improved and which were never designed for the current traffic levels let alone increases in traffic levels that would result if the proposal to build new on/off access to the A3 at Burnt Common (A43A) were to proceed. The proposed Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6655  **Respondent:** 10941057 / Tim Green  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the creation of a new 4 way interchange onto the A3 on the A247 (Policy A43A) as this would add to the ever increasing levels of traffic on the A247, A3 and through Send and Clandon. Send would become a through route to and from the A3 and will become gridlocked all day.

I object to the impact that Policy A43A will have on the air quality for those living in the surrounding areas and for future generations.

I object to the impact on residents that the resulting noise pollution of Policy A43A will have.

I object to the impact of Policy A43 and A43A on local infrastructure. Congestion levels on A247 are already increasing at an alarming rate and will be further exacerbated by the development of Garlick’s Arch as the residents will have to rely on the use of private cars.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7191  **Respondent:** 10941057 / Tim Green  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the creation of a new 4 way interchange onto the A3 on the A247 (Policy A43A) as this would add to the ever increasing levels of traffic on the A247, A3 and through Send and Clandon. Send would become a through route to and from the A3 and will become gridlocked all day. An alternative location at the current exit off the A3 going North at the far end of Burnt Common beyond the existing auction house is far more preferable as there is existing dual carriageway roads already in place.

I object to the impact of Policy A43 and A43A on local infrastructure. Congestion levels on A247 are already increasing at an alarming rate and will be further exacerbated by the development of Garlick’s Arch as the residents will have to rely on the use of private cars.

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

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7406  Respondent: 10945057 / Margaret Field  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

1. I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2990  Respondent: 10949921 / Jan Parker  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a) This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2531  Respondent: 10950561 / Jeanette Pell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5139  Respondent: 10951489 / Lorna M Cave  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object, again most strongly, to the four way access to the A3 at Burnt Common. Nobody considering this can possibly have been on Send Road/Send Barns Lane during rush hour or they would know that at these times the roads are gridlocked. Send, Ripley and Clandon would come to a complete standstill.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/8081</th>
<th>Respondent: 10952257 / Darrel Wilkinson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, I object to the plan for a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common as Send would have to take traffic from the proposed 2,000 new houses at the Wisely Airfield, 2,000 houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham and 1,850 at Blackwell Farm. Much of this traffic to and from the A3, M25, Woking and Guildford would go through Send. Send Road is already very congested, would become gridlocked (as it does sometimes now with any road-works). Noise and pollution levels, already at excess levels would worsen. The impact would continue through to Old Woking, which also suffers from major congestion.

I request that my comments are shown to the Planning Inspector who will make the decision on the Guildford Local Plan. Please confirm receipt of this email.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4206</th>
<th>Respondent: 10953793 / Hugh Thomas</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because Send would have to take traffic from the proposed 2000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 at Gosden Hill and 1850 at Blackwell Farm as well as 485 from Send itself. This is in addition to what it takes at the moment. Much of this traffic to and fro the A3, M25, Woking and Guildford would go through Send. Send Road, which is already overloaded, would face gridlock. This would exacerbate noise and pollution levels which are already excessive and is wholly unacceptable.

I OBJECT to the plan for a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because it is being presented as a way of facilitating the movement of a massive increase in vehicles whereas in reality it would cause havoc on the A247 and the many feeder roads in Ripley and Clandon in addition to Send.

I OBJECT to the fact that Guildford Councillors approved the Local Plan before the Transport Assessment had even been published which indicates what scant regard they had for the traffic implications which are at the forefront of residents’ worries. They have to contend with the problem every day in terms of delays, pollution and noise which are already destroying our villages as decent places in which to live.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a).

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

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

1. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common
   How would the local roads cope, they are small roads with housing either side, how would a major junction on and off ramp work when there are just tiny roads feeding/exiting it?

North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved.

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

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)
How would the local roads cope, they are small roads with housing either side, how would a major junction on and off ramp work when there are just tiny roads feeding/exiting it?

North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3728  Respondent: 10957313 / R Holmes  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

Policy 43a: Land at Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

Proposed allocation: New A3 on/off slip roads

response: objection

Objection response: Policy A43a: Land for new A3 on/off Slip roads, Send March/Burnt Common

I object to the proposed new on/off slip roads at Send Marsh/ burnt common.

Traffic through the village of Send is already very busy, particularly at peak times, with queues up to The Burnt Common roundabout at Old Woking. If this proposal was approved, Send would become the main through route for all traffic on to an off the M24 and A3 heading to and from the Woking area. This would have a significant detrimental affect on Send villages environment.

The A247 towards Clandon is very narrow in places and again unsuitable for increased traffic.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3065  Respondent: 10958753 / Ingrid Molossi  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of 'through' traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

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

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

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7422  Respondent: 10959681 / James Bryer  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )  

• I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common. This will seriously impact on many beautiful homes and an area of significant wildlife. If there is a need for an on/off interchange this should be by an upgrade and improvement of the Ripley Wisley interchange where there is already 50% of the required infrastructure and away from any existing housing. The A247 is unsuitable for increased traffic passage through to Woking (especially given the narrow roads through Old Woking via low lying flood prone land). It is also an important route for cycling and the proposals have not considered there health and issues connected with this growing and important national sport and pastime.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5241  Respondent: 10960033 / Lucinda Kalupka  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )  

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)  

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of 'through' traffic. The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.  

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6630  Respondent: 10960257 / Craig Church  Agent:  

Section page number 123 of 350  
Document page number 124
The proposed A3 slip road access at Burnt Common will do little to reduce this traffic as people will not want to join the A3 at Burnt Common to head north as there is always a queue caused by the M25 junction, instead they will travel along the Portsmouth road through Ripley village to jump the queue as so many drivers do now when there is heavy traffic.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6484  Respondent: 10960353 / Trish White  Agent:  

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

I object to site 43a the on and off ramp at Clandon as this will increase traffic problems in the villages.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6232  Respondent: 10961921 / Mark Johnson  Agent:  

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

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because of the dramatic increase in traffic that would accompany it along the A247 as traffic cut-through to the A3/M25. The impact of significant increases in traffic on the main A247 road would be very serious, with the potential to cause daily traffic problems.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5903  Respondent: 10967489 / Jenny Jackson  Agent:  

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

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic including traffic from London/M25 to Woking which would add to that already using the area as a bypass to current local congestion going through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is unsustainable with no proposals for improvement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7637</th>
<th>Respondent: 10967489 / Jenny Jackson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) is Sound? ( ) is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **I object** to proposals for the ‘new interchange’ onto the A3 (N) at Burnt Common which is actually unnecessary for local need and would introduce gridlock on the A247 and Portsmouth Road, all day, every day. The evidence cited about traffic is incomplete and unreliable – we all know that there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through from Woking to the A3/M25.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2903</th>
<th>Respondent: 10969601 / Jenny Paviour</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) is Sound? ( ) is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to a new interchange with A3 at Burnt Common, because Send would have to take traffic from the proposed 2000 new houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill, Bupham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm. Much of this traffic to and from the A3, M25, Woking and Guildford would go through Send. Send Road, which is already overloaded would become gridlocked. Noise and pollution levels, already at excessive levels, would worsen. This must be avoided. I feel that the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1689</th>
<th>Respondent: 10970337 / Chris Crawshay</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) is Sound? ( ) is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The new slip roads proposed for London bound traffic, which would lead to and from the A3 by the bridge on the A247 over the A3 would vastly increase traffic flows in the Burntcommon, Send & Clandon village areas. The A247 through Send would be gridlocked at rush hours, and in all probability for most of the day. At present there is a constant flow of traffic around the Burntcommon roundabout (by the Shell petrol station and Little Waitrose) all day and evening. I fear that those of us living in Boughton Hall Avenue, about 100 yards from this roundabout, would find access to and from our Avenue very difficult indeed. Our junction with the B2215 is our only entry and exit point and there are at present 76 detached properties in this estate.
I object to site A43a the on and off ramp at Burnt common/Clandon as there are already traffic problems in peak hours, so how will this help the current problem by adding more homes!

I object to any sites planned to be built on the green belt as a whole, let's not destroy what little countryside we have left.

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

Attached documents:

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

I object to the new four-way A3 interchange at Burnt Common, not only from using the unsound ELNA from 2013 rather than the significantly reduced housing needs from the 2015 ELNA as input to transport planning, but that this would
result in a major disaster for traffic through Send and Burnt Common. Connection at Burnt Common would attract traffic from further afield to join and leave the A3 (and the M25) from both north (e.g. Woking) and south. Pressure on the local transport infrastructure would be significant, with further degraded traffic flow for local people.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4397  Respondent: 10987841 / Marion Bastable  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a) This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7034  Respondent: 10987905 / Marika Chandler  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)  
The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.  
The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.  
This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3935  Respondent: 10989601 / Margaret Mew  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3914  Respondent: 10990145 / Anne Lee  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7749  Respondent: 10990785 / Valerie Golding  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

Policy A43a

I OBJECT to the proposed slip roads at Burnt Common, this will on add to traffic using the A247 drawing more traffic through Send from the south west of Woking. It is also only 2.5 miles from an existing junction. This is GBC trying to say the infrastructure is being improved to accommodate the proposed developments, but it will make matters worse on local roads.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6801  Respondent: 10992225 / Emma Ringshaw  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The proposed addition of north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc.) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7996  Respondent: 10992801 / Martine Szabo-toth  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to policy A43.30 the development of new four way interchange onto the A3 which would mean that narrow Send Road (A247) would be the main route for traffic leaving the M25 and A3. It is already crowded and vulnerable to traffic jams. Further traffic from this development would result in permanent gridlock. It simply would not work.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3172  Respondent: 10997537 / Sarah Nelson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at burnt common. The traffic through send village is already at a high, contested level. This will add to increased traffic, gridlock, resulting in noise and pollution levels that are unacceptable. We live close to send road and my daughter has developed asthma. When a big vehicle goes past the vibrations make my bed...
shake, most worrying and unpleasant. In addition the holes developing in send road are larger than pot hole and have to be repeatedly filled. The Planned interchange will exasperate this!

From a very concerned local resident with a young child.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2710  Respondent: 11000385 / Sheila Robins  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT TO site A43A the on and off ramp at Clandon/Burnt Common. This will cause complete chaos in the area, as all roads leading to the junction are country roads leading from Clandon, Ripley and Send. At present it only takes an incident at Wisley /Junction 10 of the M25 and our villages are swamped with traffic. This junction will make the whole situation worse as the local roads are so narrow and are unable to be widened to suit increased traffic flow. The Send Road only leads to similar narrow roads in Old Woking and Hoebridge areas, which are also unable to be widened.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8059  Respondent: 11001761 / Brandon Sievering  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because Send would have to take traffic from the proposed 2000 new houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm. Much of this traffic to and from the A3, M25, Woking and Guildford would go through Send. Send Road, which is already overloaded, would become gridlocked. Noise and pollution levels, already at excessive levels, would worsen.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6634  Respondent: 11002945 / David Guthrie  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because it would be disastrous for Send and the (A247) would be gridlocked all day. This would just provide an alternative route for people.

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

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2031  Respondent: 11003361 / Howard Milner  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed 4 way interchange from the A3 at Burnt Common. Policy A43

The proposal that an interchange at this part of the A3 shows no thought what so ever, how is it considered prudent to take traffic from a fast moving 3 lane “A” road and push them onto roads that are little more than country lanes, at a recent meeting GBC officers when asked about the creation of bottle necks at local points of congestion answered that they would have to “consult with other local authorities”, proving the point that no thought had been given to their plan.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1098  Respondent: 11003681 / Elizabeth Milner  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of the proposed new 4-way interchange from the A3 T Burnt Common. Policy A43.

I also note that there are other new inclusions under Policy A44 for the inclusion of 40 homes and 2 travellers’ pitched. This is absolute madness to build on landfill. Breathing pipes are in place to vent the landfill. The lanes around are too small to cope with travellers and their caravans.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3194  Respondent: 11007713 / Grahame Crispin  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )


Adopting this policy will generate unacceptable additional local traffic and heavy vehicles through Send and its already poor road network, by attracting traffic to/from Woking and surrounding areas from other routes.

The existing A3 restricted entry/exit junctions at Ockham, Burnt Common and Burpham are perfectly adequate for the current local communities, and the restrictions are extremely beneficial in minimising traffic for the villages.
If the policy were adopted, the provision of additional slip roads would also spawn demand for further as-yet unplanned development which would further increase unacceptable traffic pressure through Send and its environs; Send will become gridlocked, and noise and pollution levels become unacceptable.

Send must NOT become a Local Rural Centre.

The additional slip-roads must NOT be developed and the Policy must be abandoned.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1834</th>
<th>Respondent: 11008225 / Russell Pascoe</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>Sound?</td>
<td>Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3387</th>
<th>Respondent: 11011041 / Alan C Burchett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>Sound?</td>
<td>Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Again this development would hugely increase the volume of traffic using Send Road in both directions. As I previously stated this road is already extremely busy and frequently grid locked which is totally unfair on the people who live in Send.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these proposed developments seem to have considered the larger picture. The effect on the infrastructure, especially the traffic. I am shocked at such poor planning. It seems we are being bombarded by totally inappropriate developments with an expectation that we will complain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4195  Respondent: 11011585 / Martin Walker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the proposed interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common. The interchange will cause the A247 to become a through-road between Woking and the M25. Send is building a new primary school on that particular stretch of the A247. Creating the new interchange, together with the additional school traffic, will cause immediate and virtually permanent gridlock on the A247. Village life will be severely disrupted.

I object to the fact that this site was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously. Full consultation is required.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3159  Respondent: 11011969 / Diana Gibson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common. It would result in the A247 (Send Road) being gridlocked all day. There are no proposals to improve or widen this road. Send will be the through route to Woking for traffic leaving the M25 at Junction 10, the new development of 2,000 houses at Wisley and also the new development of 2,000 houses at Burpham. I further object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5263  Respondent: 11015617 / J Fiona Harris  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. Why? Because Send Road is already very busy, with high noise and pollution levels. Much of the traffic travelling between the A3, M25, Woking and Guildford generated by the proposed 1850 new houses at Blackwell Farm, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham and 2000 at Wisley Airfield would go through Send. This would overload an already busy, noisy and polluted road, resulting in Send becoming gridlocked. This cannot be permitted to happen.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
16.1 OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:
A43a Land for new slip roads to / from A3

- The local adjoining roads do not have sufficient capacity (especially at rush hour) to take additional traffic.
- The A3 is already stationary especially northbound during the morning rush hour. Providing another northbound slip road would attract additional traffic to the area attempting to join the A3 without success. Currently vehicles are often observed exiting the A3 at Burnt Common and queuing through Ripley before re-joining the A3 ahead of the queue.
- Burnt Common roundabout is already a bottle neck for traffic especially in the morning rush hour, often taking 10-15 minutes in the morning to cross the roundabout from Send village. Additional traffic would exacerbate this delay further increasing pollution and traffic noise.
- This section of the A3 has been highlighted as an area of high collision rates without creating a further risk of additional slip roads in close proximity to the slip roads accessing Burpham and Ripley Services.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5268  Respondent: 11032385 / Celia Guthrie  Agent:

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

I object to a new interchange with the A 3 at Burnt common. Traffic from the proposed 2000 houses at Wisley Airfield would then have to come through Send, along with traffic from all the other proposed sites in the surrounding area. Send Road is already overloaded and gridlocked during rush hour. Noise and pollution levels would reach excessive levels.

Please can these comments be passed to the Planning Inspector for review and confirm that you have received this communication.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1986  Respondent: 11032705 / Mike Tarrant  Agent:

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

I object Policy A43a, the North facing slip road to from A3 at Send Marsh/Burnt Common

On the grounds of the increase in traffic flow. Our roads already strain to cope with existing levels of traffic. Especially all the approach roads to the A3, and in particular the A247 to and from the Burnt Common roundabout. Which passes a school, a Doctors surgery and goes straight through the centre of Send, linking Guildford and Woking. The A247 is 2 way road and not suitable for the high levels and heavy traffic this will create.
I object because GBC’s Transport Assessment was not available to Councillors for the vote taken on 24th May for these proposals. It was published on 6th June! Infrastructure requirements must be assessed before major proposals can be voted on.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3117</th>
<th>Respondent: 11033985 / John Peachey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site A43a - I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because If would be disastrous for Send and the A2.47 Send Road / Broadmead to Old Woking a would be gridlocked all day. There are schools, shops and a bus route along this already congested village road. In the other direction the A2.47 towards Newlands Corner - the section between the Onslow Arms and Glandon Park is very narrow with bends and there is only just room for cars to pass each other but lorries and buses have to mount the footway.

Site A43a I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25. This interchange will cause dangerous queueing on the A3 in both directions.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/781</th>
<th>Respondent: 11034113 / Julia Gaudelli</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a) North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of “through” traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2229</th>
<th>Respondent: 11034817 / Nick Pycraft</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common for the same reasons as above; namely due to Send and Send Marsh not being able to cope with the additional traffic.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4249  Respondent: 11036417 / Len Ozanne  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I absolutely object to the proposed changes to the intersection with the A3 at Burnt Common. Any encouragement of increasing the traffic off the A3 and through the village of Send would vastly change the village and bring the village to a standstill. This proposed change, which can only be to encourage traffic into Woking, would just create a big bottleneck at the junction at Old Woking as this road is at capacity (both directions) almost all day and particularly in the morning when there are constant queues. School children would be at risk as they go to school and old people particularly as they visit the Doctors surgery which is also on the road. There might be a benefit to have an access at Burnt Common to head north on to the A3, easing some of the traffic in Ripley, but this would only be a minor positive.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1706  Respondent: 11036705 / Brian Slade  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the NEW 4-WAY A3 Junction at Garlicks Arch, Burnt Common which is a NEW Site not included in the Regulation 18 Draft and NOT previously consulted upon. This will cause major increases in traffic volumes with which the existing local road infrastructure will be unable to cope; seriously increased pollution affecting the Health and Quality of Life of local residents and wildlife: and the loss of ancient woodland and good quality agricultural land.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7222  Respondent: 11036737 / Charley Penny  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the plans to add on/off slip roads at Burnt Common (A43a) as this will increase the amount of people coming off here and using Send as a cut through to the M25 and Woking. With the thousands of houses planned to be built around this area it will continue to put strain on the A3 which is already at capacity.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6792  **Respondent:** 11036801 / Judith Mercer  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to POLICY Site  A43a Land for NEW North facing SLIP ROAD to/from A3 at Send Marsh.
This has not been given permission by Highways authority.

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

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7402  **Respondent:** 11037313 / Debbie Greener  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to a new A3 interchange at Burnt Common. The roads around here are already extremely busy already - especially Send Road. The speed the cars go past the school is far too fast and with the two schools merging into one site this will put a lot of children in grave danger. Crossing will be extremely dangerous and are you willing to put these lives in jeopardy?

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

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4831  **Respondent:** 11039681 / Bruce Jeffreson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

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

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3285  Respondent: 11040193 / Jill Stevens  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I strongly object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. This already congested and extremely busy area would be absolutely overloaded with traffic from the proposed building of huge housing numbers locally, and would see Send become extremely busy and gridlocked, with increased noise and pollution levels in the area.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2948  Respondent: 11040609 / Simon Long  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4024  Respondent: 11040705 / Patricia Cullimore  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT TO A NEW INTERCHANGE WITH THE A3 AT BURNT COMMON. If this is built the traffic would go through Send and Send Road is already heavily overloaded and the area would become gridlocked. Noise and pollution levels, which are already excessive, would worsen in a residential area. This must be avoided at all costs.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4361  Respondent: 11041153 / Melissa Ransome  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT TO A NEW INTERCHANGE WITH THE A3 AT BURNT COMMON. If this is built the traffic would go through Send and Send Road is already heavily overloaded and the area would become gridlocked. Noise and pollution levels, which are already excessive, would worsen in a residential area. This must be avoided at all costs.

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

Attached documents:
I object to the A43a on and off ramp at Burnt Common and Clandon. Traffic in this area is already a problem which this will exacerbate not alleviate.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/930  Respondent: 11041281 / Chris Harlow  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

16. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1593  Respondent: 11042369 / Huw Williams  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common.

Existing traffic volumes plus proposals for Garlick’s Arch, Gosden Hill Burpham, together with numerous smaller developments in the immediate vicinity, and also the proposed development of Wisley Airfield would result in the quantity of traffic travelling along Send Road to/from Woking becoming intolerable. This would not only affect Send and Ripley, but also Old Woking and Kingfield.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4356  Respondent: 11043073 / Ingrid Botha  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the proposed interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common. The interchange will cause the A247 to become a through-road between Woking and the M25. Send is building a new primary school on that particular stretch of the A247. Creating the new interchange, together with the additional school traffic, will cause immediate and virtually permanent gridlock on the A247, which would severely damage village life.

I object to the fact that this site was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously. Full consultation is required.

This interchange will result in significantly increased traffic volume on Send Barns Lane and Send Road as it is the only route from Burnt common to Woking.

I work on the Send Road and am held up in significant and lengthy delays on a very regular basis while travelling a very short distance along Send Road. Crossing this road is already a dangerous action to undertake as cars drive far too quickly down this road and traffic volumes are very high. Cars are parked on the sides of the road making it very narrow and it is virtually impossible to see pedestrians, particularly children, as they emerge from between the cars to cross the road.

Parking is already a problem with cars parking on the pavement in an attempt to avoid blocking the road and to allow two way traffic at all points. This results in people with babies in push chairs having to walk on the raid in the traffic to pass the cars. There are also blind residents in Send who rely on guide dogs who are equally impacted.

Traffic coming off the A3 already drives too fast down Send Barns Lane. The council have only just approved the building of new buildings to accommodate the pupils form St Bede’s on the Send First site. This planning permission did not allow for the additional parking needs that will arise from the increased pupil numbers. There will be many cars parked on Send Barns Lane and many children crossing this road where NO crossing facilities exist. The proposed interchange will bring greater volumes of high speed traffic past the school. This will place the lives of the children and Parents of Send at risk. No interchange is worth the life of a child!

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5517  Respondent: 11043425 / Melinda McLean  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the on and off rap at Burnt Common/Clandon as this will only increase the traffic problems for all in the area. When there is a problem on the A3 - and there is almost daily - the road is completely clogged. How can it possible handle more traffic?

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6796  Respondent: 11044129 / Christopher Barrass  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.
The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).
This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt common as it would encourage southbound traffic to leave at burnt common and use the already overloaded Send Road through Send village, causing it to become gridlocked.

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

Attached documents:

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. This will have little effect on the traffic flow in the area in terms of dissipating congestion which at peak hours often extends from the A3 through Ripley and up to the
roundabout at the Little Waitrose store in Send. Similarly traffic travelling in a south easterly direction towards that
roundabout frequently extends all of the way through Send village to the New Inn. I commute to London for work each
working day and park my car at Woking train station. This traffic congestion has not always existed but has become
worse each year over the last 16 years. The average time of the trip from Send to Woking takes longer each year.
Frequently there are roadworks and temporary traffic lights in place. One can only imagine the congestion and damage to
infrastructure that will result if 400 homes are built at Garlick’s Arch, 45 houses are built at Clockbarn Nursery, 40 houses
are built at Send Hill, 2000 houses are built at Wisley Airfield, 200 houses are built at Gosden Hill and 1850 houses are
built at Blackwell Farm. Much of the traffic from surrounding areas would travel through Send. Noise and pollution
levels would rise and degrade residents’ amenity.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7394  Respondent: 11048001 / Robin Dorran  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

3) I object to (A43a) the on/off ramps for the A3 at Burnt Common as it would result in an enormous increase in traffic
through Send and the surrounding villages which do not have the infrastructure to cope with this volume of traffic

Clearly this link would not be required if Garlicks Arch is not developed and the council could spend the money on more
worthwhile road improvements.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3556  Respondent: 11048769 / Peter Harmer  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

I object to the new A3 interchange at Burnt Common – increased traffic burden in the area will cause over congestion and
increased pollution

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6730  Respondent: 11061185 / Peter Komisarczuk  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )
I strongly object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a). North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for us local residents, access the A3 to the north might be nice to have for some people who are likely to be passing through. The on/off ramp addition will simply draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this route cannot be improved. I noted in 3 above, that I have not seen any modeling on this, but it is common sense that this will just make congestion worse. If GBC insists on such huge changes taking place then they MUST undertake proper analysis AND consultation AND rigorous scrutiny of the proposed Plan.

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

Attached documents:

comment ID: PSLPS16/1748  respondent: 11069601 / Barry Kiddell  agent:

document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to Policy A43A.

It could never satisfy Policy S1.

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

Attached documents:

comment ID: PSLPS16/7528  respondent: 11070113 / Alison Hague  agent:

document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

comment ID: pslp172/4198  respondent: 11070113 / Alison Hague  agent:

document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43a BURNT COMMON SLIP ROADS – My Objections

50) Provision of a northbound on-slip road and a southbound off-slip road to the A3 to join the A247. These are stated to be required to relieve Ripley from the effects of the development of Wisley. It is not clear how this would work unless traffic from Wisley wishing to go south either goes up to the A3/M25 roundabout and comes back down the A3 or (as is claimed by the promoters of the Wisley development), direct access to the A3 southbound is provided at Wisley/Ockham. In either case, slip roads at the A247 seem unnecessary. It is more likely that these slip roads are intended to provide access to the Garlick’s Arch and Burnt Common developments. The slip roads will have the effect of creating an all-ways junction with the A3 at Burnt Common making it a centre for future development and a traffic magnet with clear implications for the A247.

51) If a 4-way junction for the A3 is deemed necessary, the logical place for it would be somewhere else, where it could enable an additional bridge to be created over the Guildford to Waterloo railway line to relieve the narrow A247 and its hump backed bridge from carrying all the north-south heavy traffic which cannot, or chooses not to, pass under the other existing railway bridges.

52) My objections to increased traffic on the A247 through West Clandon are outlined more fully elsewhere but include: (i) although notionally an A-road the A247 is narrow and winding in parts and is most unsuited to carrying additional traffic, (ii) the A247 has a single non-continuous footpath in several sections, (iii) a care home, a church car park and a pub, as well as very many houses, are located on the opposite side of the road to the only footpath, making pedestrian access difficult for people moving about the village on foot, especially for elderly and disabled people; (iv) the railway station and other commercial and residential properties have poor sight lines for access onto the A247 and difficulties in accessing the A247 from these properties will be exacerbated by increased traffic volume (and fewer “gaps” between cars); (v) the A247 is popular with cyclists and because of its narrow and winding nature the potential for accidents that additional traffic will cause is clear.

53) The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion, difficulty for people in cars and on foot wishing to move about the village of West Clandon and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

54) I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day.

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

56) The proposed developments will make it even more difficult for pedestrians to move around West Clandon village crossing from one side of the road to the other, bearing in mind that many properties can only access a footpath by crossing the A247.

57) The proposed plans will make it more difficult for vehicles to exit on to the A247 from the numerous entrances along the road, particularly in the narrow and winding section of the A247 between Clandon railway station and the A247/A25 crossroads. Many public and private properties on this section of the road have poor sight lines, including the Onslow Arms, West Clandon Church car park, Ashley Park care home, Clandon railway station.

58) Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village of West Clandon on the way to the Surrey Hills for the Olympic and the Prudential Ride London route. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local Plan.

59) The A247 may be an A-road on the map but in reality it is a residential road with numerous bends, narrow sections and side-entrances. The road through West Clandon already has numerous accident black spots, such as: (I) the exit from Clandon station which has extremely poor sight lines due to a humped back bridge where numerous accidents have
occurred; (ii) the exit from the Onslow Arms pub which is almost blind due to the pub building being adjacent the road - a vehicle has recently ended up in the garden of the cottage opposite; (iii) the narrow section outside “Summers” which is regularly littered with the wing mirrors of cars which have made contact, as well as being a dangerous area for pedestrians due to vehicles mounting the pavement to try to pass; (iv) the winding section outside Clandon Regis and near the primary school which regularly suffers from demolition of gate posts and fences as vehicles leave the road; (v) the bend near West Clandon church which has seen damage caused to the flint wall in recent years.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6881  Respondent: 11077025 / David Williamson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

POLICY A43a - Burnt Common

I object to the proposed development for the following reasons:

- The proposed addition of another access to/from the A3 at this point would cause havoc on local roads. Traffic is already extremely heavy at peak times going to and from Woking. A further access onto the A3 to the north will draw a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. There is no scope to enlarge most local roads, and the effects on the local community would be catastrophic.

I object to this development and ask that the application be rejected.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4438  Respondent: 11096161 / Janice Perry  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common (A43a).

It will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic from the A3 and M25 causing already excessive traffic through Send to become gridlocked. There would be no way for this to be avoided and would also cause appalling deterioration to the air quality

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2945  Respondent: 11098241 / Sammy Chalk  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7082  
Respondent:  11098369 / Neil & Nicki Covington  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

WE OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)
The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc.) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7188  
Respondent:  11100193 / Michael Turner  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a). The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

I object to the proposed Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C). The Infrastructure Schedule sets out the key infrastructure requirements on which the delivery of the plan depends. For each of the Key Allocated Sites in the borough it identifies infrastructure projects that are required, except for Garlick’s Arch (A43) which is not mentioned. It is clear that the Plan takes no account of the infrastructure required for this site and is therefore not fit for purpose.

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

Attached documents:
In particular I OBJECT to the proposal to create a 4-way junction with the A3 at Burnt Common/Send Marsh (site A43a). This will substantially increase traffic on the A247 through West Clandon. This is a narrow winding road with many bends affecting lines of sight with regard to vehicles emerging from entrances onto the A247 in West Clandon. Two examples are the junction between the 247 and Clandon station approach road, and the exit from the Onslow Arms, both of which are the sites of regular accidents and near-misses. The increased traffic will also impact pedestrians in West Clandon severely as there is only a footpath on one side of the road, pedestrians find it difficult to cross particularly where there is limited visibility, and lorries regularly mount the pavement to pass. The road is not capable of significant improvement because it is constrained by buildings.

I OBJECT to Policy A43a for the following reasons. 
I OBJECT most strongly to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a). The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved. The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement. There is also very limited visibility from some houses, businesses and amenities for vehicles turning onto The Street or for pedestrians trying to cross The Street (e.g. Clandon railway station approach, Onslow Arms car park, Bull's Head car park, West Clandon church car park).

The A247 through West Clandon is a narrow winding road with many bends affecting lines of sight with regard to vehicles emerging from entrances onto the A247 in West Clandon. Two examples are the junction between the 247 and Clandon station approach road, and the exit from the Onslow Arms, both of which are the sites of regular accidents and near-misses. Vision at the junction with the station approach is obscured by the humped backed bridge. Vision at the Onslow Arms is obscured by the pub building being on the edge of the road. The increased traffic will also impact pedestrians in West Clandon severely as there is only a footpath on one side of the road, pedestrians find it difficult to cross particularly where there is limited visibility. This is a particular problem for elderly people and children. The road is not capable of significant improvement because it is constrained by buildings.

Note the following accident data:
2010 –2014 from Crashmap data
• Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
• Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
• Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
• Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015
• 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.
• 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions

2016
• 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
• 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road
• July 2016 Collision outside Onslow Arms resulting in one vehicle ending up in garden of cottage opposite

Within the last two weeks there has been a road traffic accident outside The Onslow Arms with one of the vehicles
ending up in the garden of Brownlow Cottage opposite the pub. On another occasion the gate post of the property next to
the Onslow Arms has been damaged. Accidents and near-misses at the junction of Clandon station approach with The
Street are extremely common and this is well-known as a dangerous junction with very limited visibility of traffic
approaching from the north.
Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon,
however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as
congestion is already very high.
This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section
18 consultation on this.
There is a constant stream of broken wing-mirrors left behind as debris evidencing the narrowness of the A247 at some
sections. Within the last couple of years there has been at least one collision between a vehicle and a building (Summers
Barn) at a narrow section. The A247 already has a disproportionate amount of traffic to cope with compared to
neighbouring villages because it has a road crossing over (rather than under) the railway line.
Around 100 houses, businesses and amenities have an access directly onto The Street (or Clandon Road). Some of these
have very limited visibility (lines of sight), except through the use of mirrors.
The danger of traffic in West Clandon not only affects vehicles but also pedestrians. The linear nature of the village, plus
the fact that the road is only wide enough for a footpath on one side at various points, means that the frequency of passing
vehicles can make it difficult for pedestrians to enter and exit some properties at busy times. This can be particularly
difficult for an elderly person or a child. If the volume of traffic increases, the situation will become worse.
The A247 splits the village of West Clandon in half. It divides the church on the west side of The Street from its car park
on the east side of The Street. It has to be negotiated by elderly residents of the Ashley Park Care Home, children and
parents dropping off or collecting from the Clandon Infant School, users of the two pubs on opposite sides of the road, the
railway station, the Recreation Ground and The Royal British Legion.
If there is a higher volume of traffic (at whatever speed), it will be harder to find a gap in the traffic during busy times in
order to safely cross The Street. A pedestrian crossing cannot be provided from every house or every business or amenity
and there is insufficient room to allow footpaths to be built on both sides of The Street.
The number of cyclists that use the A247 as a route to access The North Downs has increased massively following the
well publicised use of cycle routes in this area during the Olympics and in national cycle events. The A247 is now a
corridor for cyclists accessing the Downs from Woking and beyond. The winding and narrow nature of the A247 makes it
difficult for other vehicles to overtake these cyclists. If the volume of traffic increases then this will only make this
problem worse and lead to a higher risk of accidents as more vehicles try to overtake cyclists on narrow winding roads.
Many of the above concerns are specific to West Clandon because it is a linear village divided by the A247 which is
narrow, winding and in places bordered by a footpath on only one side. Because it winds through the historic centre of
West Clandon there is no possibility of the A247 being widened or of additional footpaths being provided alongside the
road, or of improvements to visibility for entrances on to or off The Street. For all of these reasons I consider any
significant increase in the volume of traffic on the A247 through West Clandon could have a seriously damaging impact
on the quality of life of residents of West Clandon including the approximately 100 homes with entrances directly off The
Street/Clandon Road, and on users of West Clandon's railway station, pubs, infant school, church, old people's home,
Royal British Legion club, recreation ground and public footpaths

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4156</th>
<th>Respondent: 11104033 / David Dutton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Policy A43a BURNT COMMON SLIP ROADS – My Objections

50) Provision of a northbound on-slip road and a southbound off-slip road to the A3 to join the A247. These are stated to
be required to relieve Ripley from the effects of the development of Wisley. It is not clear how this would work unless
traffic from Wisley wishing to go south either goes up to the A3/M25 roundabout and comes back down the A3 or (as is claimed by the promoters of the Wisley development), direct access to the A3 southbound is provided at Wisley/Ockham. In either case, slip roads at the A247 seem unnecessary. It is more likely that these slip roads are intended to provide access to the Garlick's Arch and Burnt Common developments. The slip roads will have the effect of creating an all-ways junction with the A3 at Burnt Common making it a centre for future development and a traffic magnet with clear implications for the A247.

51) If a 4-way junction for the A3 is deemed necessary, the logical place for it would be somewhere else, where it could enable an additional bridge to be created over the Guildford to Waterloo railway line to relieve the narrow A247 and its hump backed bridge from carrying all the north-south heavy traffic which cannot, or chooses not to, pass under the other existing railway bridges.

52) My objections to increased traffic on the A247 through West Clandon are outlined more fully elsewhere but include: (i) although notionally an A-road the A247 is narrow and winding in parts and is most unsuited to carrying additional traffic, (ii) the A247 has a single non-continuous footpath in several sections, (iii) a care home, a church car park and a pub, as well as very many houses, are located on the opposite side of the road to the only footpath, making pedestrian access difficult for people moving about the village on foot, especially for elderly and disabled people; (iv) the railway station and other commercial and residential properties have poor sight lines for access onto the A247 and difficulties in accessing the A247 from these properties will be exacerbated by increased traffic volume (and fewer “gaps” between cars); (v) the A247 is popular with cyclists and because of its narrow and winding nature the potential for accidents that additional traffic will cause is clear.

53) The A247 may be an A-road on the map but in reality it is a residential road with numerous bends, narrow sections and side-entrances. The road through West Clandon already has numerous accident black spots, such as: (I) the exit from Clandon station which has extremely poor sight lines due to a humped back bridge where numerous accidents have occurred; (ii) the exit from the Onslow Arms pub which is almost blind due to the pub building being adjacent the road - a vehicle has recently ended up in the garden of the cottage opposite; (iii) the narrow section outside “Summers” which is regularly littered with the wing mirrors of cars which have made contact, as well as being a dangerous area for pedestrians due to vehicles mounting the pavement to try to pass; (iv) the winding section outside Clandon Regis and near the primary school which regularly suffers from demolition of gate posts and fences as vehicles leave the road; (v) the bend near West Clandon church which has seen damage caused to the flint wall in recent years.

54) The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion, difficulty for people in cars and on foot wishing to move about the village of West Clandon and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

55) I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day.

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

57) The proposed developments will make it even more difficult for pedestrians to move around West Clandon village crossing from one side of the road to the other, bearing in mind that many properties can only access a footpath by crossing the A247.

58) The proposed plans will make it more difficult for vehicles to exit on to the A247 from the numerous entrances along the road, particularly in the narrow and winding section of the A247 between Clandon railway station and the A247/A25 crossroads. Many public and private properties on this section of the road have poor sight lines, including the Onslow Arms, West Clandon Church car park, Ashley Park care home, Clandon railway station.

59) Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the village of West Clandon on the way to the Surrey Hills for the Olympic and the Prudential Ride London route. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local Plan.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3034  Respondent: 11107105 / Michelle Manester  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

Lastly I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. The significant amount of increased traffic would be detrimental to Send. Send Road is already under strain from the volume of traffic and is often gridlocked. It doesn't cope well as it is! Noise and pollution levels would further increase and would have a negative impact on the area.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3148  Respondent: 11114721 / Elizabeth Wilcockson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

16. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7482  Respondent: 11151009 / Maggie Smith  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

1. I object to the proposed A3 interchange at Burnt Common (Policy A43A) for the same reason as above. The road through Send would become an artery for the A3 traffic and the effect on the nature and character of the village would be disastrous.
I should be grateful if you would ensure that my comments are brought to the attention of the Planning Inspector who will review and decide on the Plan.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/504  **Respondent:** 11151617 / Nigel Tallick  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

1. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/975  **Respondent:** 11160001 / Andy Freebody  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3705  **Respondent:** 15062145 / Philippa Hackett  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the 4-way intersection.
I object to the fact that the road infrastructure through Send has not been thought about and the consequences of putting a large interchange on this site would cause gridlock. The amount of traffic this will create through Send is unfeasible as there is only one two way street that goes through the centre of the village. The intersection would have to take traffic from the proposed 2000 new houses in Wisley Airfield, 2000 new houses in Gosden Hill and 1850 new houses at Blackwell Farm. The traffic from Woking heading to and from the A3 and M25 would come through Send. The traffic congestion is one aspect but there are other considerations such as noise pollution, air pollution levels, weight of traffic on country roads and the damage that will be caused not to mention the destruction of the village and the way of life here.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3923  Respondent: 15062145 / Philippa Hackett  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the fact that the road infrastructure through Send has not been thought about and the consequences of putting a large interchange on this site would cause gridlock. The amount of traffic this will create through Send is unfeasible as there is only one two way street that goes through the centre of the village. The intersection would have to take traffic from the proposed 2000 new houses in Wisley Airfield, 2000 new houses in Gosden Hill and 1850 new houses at Blackwell Farm. The traffic from Woking heading to and from the A3 and M25 would come through Send. The traffic congestion is one aspect but there are other considerations such as noise pollution, air pollution levels, weight of traffic on country roads and the damage that will be caused not to mention the destruction of the village and the way of life here.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2875  Respondent: 15062625 / Stephen Groves  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. Send would need to accommodate the traffic for the proposed 2000 new houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 new houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham as well as the 1850 proposed new houses at Blackwell Farm. Much of the traffic between these sites, the A3 and M25 would come through and the traffic congestion is one aspect but there are other considerations such as noise pollution, air pollution level, weight of traffic on country roads and the damage that will be caused not to mention the destruction of the village and the way of life here.

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

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/3302  Respondent: 15063745 / John Pryce  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the A43a site for the on and off ramp at Burnt Common as this will cause massive traffic jams through Ripley and Send which already have enough problems as it is!

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/14  Respondent: 15067425 / Anita Fairbairn  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I strongly object to this proposal. It will create an unacceptable level of traffic on Send Road. Send would become the through route to Woking for traffic leaving the A3 and the M25.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/270  Respondent: 15068257 / Thomas Tuck  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

3) I object to site A43a the on and off ramp at Clandon

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/338  Respondent: 15081569 / Gary Cable  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

My final and total objection is the creation of the 4 way junction at Burnt Common which really seems to be the crux behind the 400 homes at Garlicks Arch and probably the eventual building of the 2000 homes at Wisley. The road infrastructure cannot cope with this - the A3 is congested EVERY morning as you approach the M25 leading to many cars using Ripley as a cut through - if traffic starts to be able to come off at Burnt Common plus the new homes this is going to lead to congestion the whole day on all the surrounding roads. Many of the roads cannot be improved to take more traffic, and whilst the councillors said the A247 has been earmarked for £1million pounds investment over the next
10 years - he could not say what they would do with the money. No amount of money can help this road take more traffic - yet it is the only route from all these homes to the Woking Waterloo fast train to London.

I object totally to the new local plan - DONT DESTROY OUR VILLAGES

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2116  Respondent: 15081921 / Robert Neal  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A43: I OBJECT to the addition of 8 traveller sites as provision has already been made within the Send/Send Marsh area.

A43A: Given that site A58 has now been changed to a "Strategic Employment Site the proposed A3 slip road at this site is inappropriate and I continue to OBJECT as a more appropriate site would be adjacent to the proposed Send Business Park (site 14) which abuts an underused dual carriage way (London Road) and is opposite land used for a "car boot sale". Plus siting a slip road here would also serve the proposed "Godsden Hill" development. It seems that the bribe of free land outweighs common sense as should A43A go ahead the additional heavy vehicular traffic from site A58 would increase noise and air pollution in the area and will doubtless lead to legal challenge at considerable expense to the GBC. On these grounds I strongly OBJECT to site A43A and suggest consideration be given to a slip road being included within site 14.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2216  Respondent: 15084897 / Save Send Action Group (Andrew Procter)  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

43 POLICY A43a BURNT COMMON

43.1 I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a). The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

43.2 The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

43.3 I object to the proposed Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C). The Infrastructure Schedule sets out the key infrastructure requirements on which the delivery of the plan depends. For each of the Key Allocated Sites in the borough it identifies infrastructure projects that are required, except for Garlick’s Arch (A43) which is not mentioned. It is clear that the Plan takes no account of the infrastructure required for this site and is therefore not fit for purpose.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPS16/1617  Respondent: 15086017 / Shuli Sinai  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

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

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

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/87  Respondent: 15102209 / Martin Manktelow  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

Policy A43a This policy relates to a four way junction giving North and South bound entrances and exits to the A3. Whilst many local people would welcome easier access to the A3, the local feeder roads are all narrow and already congested. The Clandon Road A247 is again already heavily congested night and morning. When the road reaches the village of West Clandon where it becomes The Street, it narrows down even further. It is totally unsuitable as an access to the A3.

The Northbound access would run over a piece of Manorial land owned by the Manor of Dedswell and Papworth, surely such land should be preserved.

The implications for traffic are dramatic. Every day Portsmouth Road is stacked back from the M25 to the Send traffic lights on the A247 from 8.00am to about 9.15am every day and then the flow is reversed in the evening. As there are no improvement planned for the A247 and other surrounding feeder roads this is an unsuitable change.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6568  Respondent: 15106593 / Louise Clark  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burntcommon because Send and Ripley would need to take traffic from all new developments in the area, namely any at Wisley, Gosden Hill or Burpham plus traffic from Woking and surrounding areas will further choke and gridlock Send and Ripley.
Again, the site would not make a clean environment for residents with ever-growing pollution from the already over-used A3. The A3 is already choked most of the day with traffic approaching the M25 and in the evening around the A3 Guildford bypass. The local infrastructure cannot support this and there are other areas that would suit development better with a totally new junction onto the M25 required.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/687</th>
<th>Respondent: 15108161 / Garry Lochhead</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</td>
<td>Sound? ( )</td>
<td>Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object strongly to the planned additions of north and south-facing slip roads to the A3 in the vicinity of Garlick’s Arch and Burnt common on the basis that it will throw unmanageable levels of extra traffic onto the already busy A247 through Send Village.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2641</th>
<th>Respondent: 15129441 / Janice Baker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</td>
<td>Sound? ( )</td>
<td>Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/181</th>
<th>Respondent: 15136481 / Roy Padgett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</td>
<td>Sound? ( )</td>
<td>Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I object to the proposed on and off ramp at Clandon (site A43a) which will add to the traffic problems in the surrounding villages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment ID: PSLPS16/205  Respondent: 15138049 / Mark Leonard  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to site A43a the on and off ramp at Clandon, this will only increase traffic in the village not help us at all.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7297  Respondent: 15138433 / Sylvia Pyne  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because this would attract a considerable increase of traffic on the A247 at Send Road and Send Barns Lane. In recent years there have been many road works on, or leading to, this road and the result has been complete gridlock.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4451  Respondent: 15140417 / Jeff Greenwood  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the A43a the on and off ramp at Clandon - this will increase traffic problems in the villages, not help them !

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4461  Respondent: 15140641 / Sandra Greenwood  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the A43a the on and off ramp at Clandon - this will increase traffic problems in the villages, not help them !

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

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/240</th>
<th>Respondent: 15143297 / Ronald Mounsey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to site A43a the on, and off ramp at Clandon. This will increase traffic problems in the villages, not help them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/244</th>
<th>Respondent: 15143393 / Susan Mounsey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to site A43a the on, and off ramp at Clandon. This will increase traffic problems in the villages, not help them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5410</th>
<th>Respondent: 15143681 / Mark Clover</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed development at Garlick's Arch and the new on off slip roads from the A3 will turn our village into a solid roadblock at peak times, the road simply cannot carry the increase in traffic the development will bring!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/251</th>
<th>Respondent: 15143937 / Helen Strudwick</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy A43a -I object to the proposed A3 junction for reasons of additional traffic congestion, damage to existing roads and reduced air quality and increased pollution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment ID: PSLPS16/8035  Respondent: 15144065 / Margaret Heard  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )  
I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)  
North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved.  
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?  
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/252  Respondent: 15144161 / Karen Patterson  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )  
I OBJECT to policy A43.30 the development of new four way interchange onto the A3 which would mean that narrow Send Road (A247) would be the main route for traffic leaving the M25 and A3. It is already crowded and vulnerable to traffic jams. Further traffic from this development would result in permanent gridlock. It simply would not work.  
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?  
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2400  Respondent: 15147841 / N Golbengian  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )  
** I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)  
This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.  
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?  
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1598  Respondent: 15150817 / Robert Winborn  Agent:  

Attached documents:
3) I OBJECT TO the on and off ramp at site A43a Burnt Common/Clandon Road this will cause the traffic to be railroaded through the villages and result in increased traffic problems not help them.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/318  **Respondent:** 15154241 / Brendan Laing  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

1. I object to the building of new A3 slip roads on the Burnt Common junction. These ramps will not only provide access for an unnecessary new site, but will create alternative routes for congested M25 traffic. The proposed traffic plan includes a mere £1.5m to improve the traffic lights in Send, the village is already at standstill during rush hour due to the Old woking mini-roundabout.

1. I also object to the building of new A3 slip roads on the Burnt Common junction as this will increase traffic and damage air quality and congestion around the burnt common roundabout. The roundabout often is congested at peak times. It can take over 20minutes to get to Clandon station from Ripley.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/323  **Respondent:** 15154593 / Linda Davis  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object because:
- the site was not included in the regulation 18 draft and the site has not been consulted on previously;
- it is currently Green Belt and building on the site will undermine Send’s village status;
- a new 4 way interchange onto the A3 would make Send a through route for traffic leaving the A3 and M25 for Woking, overloading the road through Send village. The A3 is a main artery through the borough but only works if the traffic is able to travel smoothly and is not interrupted by frequent junctions where traffic joining or leaving impede the flow causing a detrimental effect on the highway.
- proposed improvements to the A247 through Send would not alleviate the congestion situation because the bottleneck is at the Old Woking roundabout – there is simply no road capacity leading to the A247 from Woking to allow traffic to flow – there are already long queues and delays during peak times;
- the need for additional industrial development has not been demonstrated.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/328</th>
<th>Respondent: 15154849 / Julia Laing</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the building of new A3 slip roads on the Burnt Common junction. These ramps will not only provide access for an unnecessary new site, but will create alternative routes for congested M25 traffic. The proposed traffic plan includes a mere £1.5m to improve the traffic lights in Send, the village is already at standstill during rush hour due to the Old woking mini-roundabout.

2. I also object to the building of new A3 slip roads on the Burnt Common junction as this will increase traffic and damage air quality and congestion around the burnt common roundabout. The roundabout often is congested at peak times. It can take over 20 minutes to get to Clandon station from Ripley.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/336</th>
<th>Respondent: 15154977 / Janine Arthur</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the building of new A3 slip roads on the Burnt Common junction. These ramps will not only provide access for an unnecessary new site, but will create alternative routes for congested M25 traffic. The proposed traffic plan includes a mere £1.5m to improve the traffic lights in Send, the village is already at standstill during rush hour due to the Old woking mini-roundabout.

2. I also object to the building of new A3 slip roads on the Burnt Common junction as this will increase traffic and damage air quality and congestion around the burnt common roundabout. The roundabout often is congested at peak times. It can take over 20 minutes to get to Clandon station from Ripley.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/347</th>
<th>Respondent: 15155617 / David Vallath-Patel</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)
The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

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

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. The added traffic passing through Ripley, Send and Clandon would be enormously detrimental, It would not be sustainable as access through these villages cannot be improved.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/479  Respondent: 15174145 / Kathleen Mylet  Agent: 

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

3) I object to the creation of a 4-Way Junction with the A3 at Burntcommon.(A43a)

This would be a disaster for Clandon, Sendmarsh and Send, leading to Gridlock in these villages.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/613  Respondent: 15192481 / Thomas Collins  Agent: 

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

I object to the proposed development of the new 4-way interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. While the provision of appropriate transport infrastructure and services is one of the most pressing issues facing Guildford borough, I am concerned that the combination of this junction and the proposed traffic calming measures in Ripley (as per the strategic highway assessment report) would serve to funnel a significant increased volume of traffic along the A247. This could be further exacerbated by the proposed developments of Wisley airfield, Blackwell Farm and Gosden Hill that are included in the local plan and it is hard to determine whether the highway assessment report made any attempt to model the impact of these developments. The new A3 junction would also encourage the use of the A247 as a ratrun whenever there are problems on the M25 that people would like to avoid, which would be very detrimental to the character of the local area.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/500  Respondent: 15196161 / Michael Corlett  Agent: 

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

I object to the proposed development of the new 4-way interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. While the provision of appropriate transport infrastructure and services is one of the most pressing issues facing Guildford borough, I am concerned that the combination of this junction and the proposed traffic calming measures in Ripley (as per the strategic highway assessment report) would serve to funnel a significant increased volume of traffic along the A247. This could be further exacerbated by the proposed developments of Wisley airfield, Blackwell Farm and Gosden Hill that are included in the local plan and it is hard to determine whether the highway assessment report made any attempt to model the impact of these developments. The new A3 junction would also encourage the use of the A247 as a ratrun whenever there are problems on the M25 that people would like to avoid, which would be very detrimental to the character of the local area.

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

Attached documents:
5. Policy A43a. I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Send Marsh/Burnt Common. This would add to the gridlock on the A3 at peak times which is already a major problem, and it would become a major access point to the A3 from Woking East Surrey and the approach roads and infrastructure are totally insufficient.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/523  Respondent: 15198337 / Jack Tallick  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/731  Respondent: 15198913 / Diana Gordon  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

4) The creation of new north and southbound slip roads to and from the A3 to the A247 Clandon Road (Policy A43A) at Burnt Common.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/543  Respondent: 15205569 / Mark Gurdon  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because it would be disastrous for Send and the (A247) would be gridlocked all day.
2. I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/550  
Respondent: 15205921 / Elizabeth Howlett  
Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

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

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25. The traffic light intersection is already a major hazard for pedestrians as the walkway is only wide enough for one person, and unsuitable for parents walking their children to the local schools.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/558  
Respondent: 15206497 / Vivien Bancroft  
Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to policy A43.30 the development of new four way interchange onto the A3 which would mean that narrow Send Road (A247) would be the main route for traffic leaving the M25 and A3. It is already crowded and vulnerable to traffic jams. Further traffic from this development would result in permanent gridlock. It simply would not work.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/588  **Respondent:** 15208353 / Janet Green  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

3) I OBJECT TO site A43a the on and off ramp at Clandon- this will increase traffic problems in the villages not help them!

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/594  **Respondent:** 15208417 / Colin Green  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

3) I OBJECT TO site A43a the on and off ramp at Clandon- this will increase traffic problems in the villages not help them!

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/599  **Respondent:** 15208513 / Lauren Green  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

3) I OBJECT TO site A43a the on and off ramp at Clandon- this will increase traffic problems in the villages not help them!

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/605  **Respondent:** 15208545 / Charlotte Green  **Agent:**
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3) I OBJECT TO site A43a the on and off ramp at Clandon- this will increase traffic problems in the villages not help them!

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7363  Respondent: 15216129 / Timothy Hewlett  Agent: 

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

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/649  Respondent: 15220097 / Douglas Barr Trudy Amos  Agent: 

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

14. We object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/653  Respondent: 15220321 / K P Buchanan  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed new interchange on the A3 at Burnt Common because it will lead to heavy congestion, noise and pollution from slow moving traffic through Send. This junction is inappropriate and ill considered. The roads in the area are already saturated with traffic and this junction will result in a huge increase in traffic, some of which will be using the junction will result in a huge increase in traffic, some of which will be using the junction as a shortcut from the A3/Burnt Common to Junction 11 on the M25.

I object to the total erosion of the Green Belt in this area. The vast majority of the housing development proposed in this Draft Plan is on Green Belt. The housing need is inflated and the actual housing needs can be met on brown field sites within the Borough.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/656</th>
<th>Respondent: 15225281 / Roger Gamlin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( No ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I Object

GBC has not followed correct procedure, this requires full consultation under Regulation 18.

Traffic flow will be too heavy for local roads to bear, this is Greenbelt land and should remain so.

This junction is not needed.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6384</th>
<th>Respondent: 15225281 / Roger Gamlin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would like most to Object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common, this is totally unnecessary as there is a North flow junction at Wisley and it will cause destruction of local forestry.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6422</th>
<th>Respondent: 15225281 / Roger Gamlin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. I object to the inclusion of Land for new north facing slip roads to/from A3 at Send Marsh/Burnt Common (A43a).

This is only being included in the Plan as a result of the inclusion of the Garlick’s Arch site (A43). The creation of this junction will create more traffic through Ripley, Clandon and Send.

Should the junction be deemed necessary I am concerned that the land being allocated for the junction will result in a sub-standard junction being created using the existing slip road accesses, rather than investing in a full upgrade to the junction, which may require the compulsory purchase of surrounding land.

The Plan anticipates the delivery of these new slip roads between 2021 and 2027, way after the anticipated delivery of the Site 43. These improvements to the A3 are controlled by Highways England and not Guildford Borough Council. Highways England has indicated that they do not have plans to consider improvements to the A3 before 2020. In reality the new slip roads will not happen at best until the back end of the proposed time frame.

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

Attached documents:
### Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

4) The creation of new north and southbound slip roads to and from the A3 to the A247 Clandon Road (Policy A43A) at Burnt Common.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/706</th>
<th>Respondent: 15231489 / Alan Road</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the massive new 4 way roundabout at Burnt Common.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/721</th>
<th>Respondent: 15233217 / Mary Allwood</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I also object to the 4 way interchange on the A3 at Burnt Common as this would also cause a lot of traffic onto our small roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/725</th>
<th>Respondent: 15233633 / Hilary Head</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) I object to the site A43a the creation of new north and southbound slip roads to and from the A247 Clandon Road at Burnt Common ...this will greatly increase traffic problems in Send (A247) and Ripley as Send will become a through route for Woking for traffic leaving M25 and A3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment ID: PSLPS16/735  Respondent: 15234017 / Martin Head  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

- I object to the site A43a the creation of new north and southbound slip roads to and from the A247 Clandon Road at Burnt Common. This will greatly increase traffic problems through both Send and Ripley as this will become a through route to Woking from the M25 and A3.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/748  Respondent: 15234849 / Alastair Fleming  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

In particular, I object on the following basis.

1. I object to the creation of a new 4 way interchange onto the A3 on the A247 (Policy A43A) as this would add to the ever increasing levels of traffic on the A247, A3 and through Send and Clandon. Send would become a through route to and from the A3 and will become gridlocked all day.

2. I object to the impact that Policy A43A will have on the air quality for those living in the surrounding areas and for future generations.

3. I object to the impact on residents that the resulting noise pollution of Policy A43A will have.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5153  Respondent: 15238049 / Glenda Charlick  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to site A43a the on and off ramp at Burnt Common/Clandon - this will increase traffic problems in the villages, not help them

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/766  Respondent: 15238881 / Stephen John Tully  Agent:
I object to site A43a on and off ramp at Clandon, this will increase traffic problems.

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

Attached documents:

In particular, I object on the following basis.

1. I object to the creation of a new 4 way interchange onto the A3 on the A247 (Policy A43A) as this would add to the ever increasing levels of traffic on the A247, A3 and through Send and Clandon. Send would become a through route to and from the A3 and will become gridlocked all day.

2. I object to the impact that Policy A43A will have on the air quality for those living in the surrounding areas and for future generations.

3. I object to the impact on residents that the resulting noise pollution of Policy A43A will have.

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

Attached documents:

5. The inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition of North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, and the bottle necks of Send and Old Woking.

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

Attached documents:
2 I object to the proposed on/off ramp at Burnt Common. This will increase the amount of traffic going through Ripley, Send and Old Woking and should there be any closure on the A3 the traffic will be diverted through these villages, as it has been in the past, and the roads will be gridlocked.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/859  Respondent: 15245697 / Justine Butler  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT TO site A43a the on and off ramp at Clandon - this will increase traffic problems in the villages.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/879  Respondent: 15246497 / G F Bennett  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

It is also proposed to build a new 4 way on/off ramp to the A3 at Burnt Common. How is this supposed to answer the problems caused by hundreds of extra cars, vans and trucks passing through and converging on Send, Ripley and Clandon?

Losing the green belt would be a huge loss of history and amenities in an attractive and much loved area.

Please think again.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/882  Respondent: 15246497 / G F Bennett  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the new 4 way on/off ramp to A3 at Burnt Common. It is bad enough now, further traffic would cause grid lock and so much more pollution.

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

Attached documents:
1. I object to the proposed new junction for the A3 at Burnt Common. The A247 to Woking will provide a short cut for many and this road is already at capacity. It is a minor road with cars parked on it and cannot take more traffic. All the proposed development will also increase traffic into Potters Lane where we live. This road is narrow and has an exit directly from the A3. It is already a dangerous road because traffic, including lorries, speeds down it from the A3 - it is a narrow twisty lane and is very dangerous to cyclists, pedestrians and motorists alike.

Please bear in mind the objections and concerns above and of the local residents. We live in an already busy and congested area and we are committed to maintaining the precious countryside around us. Please do not destroy our rural area.

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

Attached documents:

5. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

How would the local roads cope, they are small roads with housing either side, how would a major junction on and off ramp work when there are just tiny roads feeding/exiting it?

North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved.

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

Attached documents:

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.
The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/949  **Respondent:** 15254113 / R Orchard  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of 'through' traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6547  **Respondent:** 15254337 / Ben Warwick  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/952  **Respondent:** 15254785 / M.D. Vickers  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

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

Attached documents:
1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:
9.17 ‘Land for new north facing slip roads to/from A3 at Send Marsh / Burnt Common’ is allocated under Policy A43a in the Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites June 2016 for the delivery of a new northbound on-slip and a new southbound off-slip to and from the A3 trunk road to and from the A247 Clandon Road.

9.18 As with Policy A43 this site was not previously included in the Regulation 18 consultation for the emerging Local Plan and has been included at a very late stage in the development process of the Local Plan. As with the Garlick’s Arch site above, the draft of the plan presented to the Executive Advisory Board on 13th April 2016 did not include these slip roads. By the time the plan was considered at the Extraordinary Council meeting on 24th May 2016, it had been added.

9.19 As a consequence of this late inclusion of the site within the Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites June 2016 the Council have failed to comply with the requirements of the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) in relation to the preparation of the sustainability appraisal.

9.20 Paragraph 005 (Reference ID 11-005-20140306) of the ‘Strategic Environmental Assessment and Sustainability Assessment’ section of the NPPG sets out the requirement for a sustainability appraisal to be produced during the preparation of a Local Plan.

9.21 The NPPG is clear that the “local planning authority must carry out an appraisal of the sustainability of the proposals.” This is designed to “help the authority to assess how the plan will contribute to the achievement of sustainable development” and “applies to any of the documents that can form part of a Local Plan, including core strategies, site allocation documents and area action plans.”

9.22 The land allocated as part of Policy A43a of the Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites June 2016 is not included or assessed as part of the Sustainability Appraisal which has been prepared in support of the emerging Local Plan.

9.23 The Council therefore cannot demonstrate that they have thoroughly or rigorously assessed the sustainability of the proposals contained within the Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites June 2016 and cannot fully determine how the plan will contribute to the achievement of sustainable development in the absence of this assessment.

9.24 In the absence of a Sustainability Appraisal for this site, the inclusion of Policy A43a within the Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites June 2016 cannot be considered to be justified or sound.

9.25 Furthermore, the site at Garlick’s Arch and associated slip roads (site references A43 and A43a) fall under several ownerships, increasing the difficulties in bringing forward this site, further emphasising the likelihood of delays in the delivery of these sites.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/963  Respondent: 15256449 / S Withers  Agent:

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

I object to the new 4-way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common which would have disastrous effect on the traffic in Send and Ripley which is already congested and used as a cut through from Woking to the A3.

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

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/967  Respondent: 15256705 / R.V. Vickers  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/970  Respondent: 15256833 / C J Vickers  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8245  Respondent: 15262273 / Michael Mead  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Policy 43a

The New North and South slip-roads to and from A3 to the A2.47 Glandon Road) would generate considerably more traffic, pollution and noise through the A2.47 Glandon road, Send Village leading to Old Woking, along both roads which are already at capacity without any widening possibility.

We all understand the need to build new houses, within the borough but all brown field sites should first be used.

I would also favour limited development on the old Wisley airfield providing connecting Country lanes are protected.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4514  Respondent: 15262305 / L J Crane  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to policy A43.30 the development of new four way interchange onto the A3 which would mean that narrow Send road (A247) would be the main route for traffic leaving the M25 and A3. It is already crowded and vulnerable to traffic jams. Further traffic from this development would result in permanent gridlock. It simply would not work.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1066  Respondent: 15263073 / James Walker  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

16.I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1073</th>
<th>Respondent: 15263905 / Philip Walker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16.1 OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1078</th>
<th>Respondent: 15264001 / Robert Peake</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16.1 OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1084</th>
<th>Respondent: 15265793 / Sam Rowley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3  I OBJECT TO SITE A43A THE ON AND OFF RAMP AT CLANDON

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5886  Respondent: 15275201 / Jennifer Morritt  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved and the roads are not able to withstand this level of traffic.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8319  Respondent: 15278465 / Chris Wright  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1289  Respondent: 15284993 / Samantha Thompson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:
The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1662  Respondent: 15292129 / Shirley Wilson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the A43a Land for new north facing slip roads to/from the A3 at Send Marsh/Burnt Common the infrastructure connections would aid local Green Belt development which the local area cannot cope with.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1320  Respondent: 15295809 / David Lees  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the proposed on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The local communities do not need North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common; these would draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic, for example all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common. The villages do not need this and this is not sustainable as the roads cannot be improved.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1322  Respondent: 15296289 / Angela Pope  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

As someone who attends regular meetings in Send and is a frequent user of the A3M25, I object to these proposals because of the congestion it will cause in Ripley, Send and Clandon and the additional traffic on the already busy A3/ M25.
On/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

Traffic to Woking could use Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking as a cut through causing unprecedented traffic levels and air pollution in the area.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1325  Respondent: 15296545 / Catherine Lees  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common.

The proposed North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would have disastrous effect on the local communities of Send, Ripley and Clandon (which do need to access the A3 to the north) but the addition will draw in a huge amount of 'through' traffic. For example, all the traffic from London/M25 going towards Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which would cause immeasurable damage to these villages.

This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved as these local roads are too confined to have their capacity significantly increased, even if this were desirable, which it is clearly not.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1344  Respondent: 15298497 / John David Scott  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

1. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved. This will impact massively in relation to quality of life and safety, pollution and noise.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1585  Respondent: 15299041 / Elizabeth Teece  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. **I OBJECT to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common** because Send would have to take traffic from the proposed 2000 new houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill Burpham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm. Much of this traffic to and from the A3, M25, Woking and Guildford would go through, Send and Send Road which is already overloaded with traffic.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1378  **Respondent:** 15300385 / Mark Harding  **Agent:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

1. **I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)**

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1388  **Respondent:** 15301761 / Paul Norman  **Agent:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

- **NEW A3 JUNCTION** - the notion of a 4 way junction onto the A3 at Burnt Common would **NOT** alleviate any of the current traffic issues in and around Send and Ripley - on the contrary it would **ATTRACT** more traffic as it would be seen as an 'easy' option to using the current Ripley North bound and Burnt Common South bound access ramps on to the A3. Both Send & Ripley canntake an increase in traffic without severe detriment to the quality of everyday life be it frustration in traffic jams or ill-health caused by increased pollution.

- **DEVELOPMENT AT GARLICKS ARCH** - This is a new proposed site and has not been consulted upon previously and no exceptional circumstances have been put forward to justify this inappropriate development within the Green The site has a particular conservation sensitivity as it is covered in ancient woodland where some trees are reported as 500 years old. The proposal includes for Industrial development which could easily be provided at nearby Slyfield Industrial Estate where current infrastructure could be upgraded to cope with such increase.
• LACK OF CONSULTATION - There are sites in the Draft Local Plan that were not included in the Regulation 18 draft such as Garlicks Arch, Winds Ridge and Send Hill and have NOT been considered upon previously. One of the sites is reported to be unsafe by way of land fill waste and is therefore unsuitable for development.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1390  Respondent: 15302081 / C.A. Sayers  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1398  Respondent: 15304897 / Richard Baker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1407  Respondent: 15312769 / Norah Johnson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved. Once off the A3 at Burnt Common the roads through Clandon have pinch points where it is difficult to drive through if a lorry, coach or bus is coming the other way, this could cause an accident. The Send Road in the other direction is also narrow in places and the amount of extra traffic these new ramps will attract has not been investigated.

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

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

1. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1439  Respondent: 15320801 / J.A Sayers  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1576  Respondent: 15321217 / Sally Rule  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1455  Respondent: 15323841 / Claire Parker  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

5. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)
North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1477</th>
<th>Respondent: 15325505 / Mark Dominey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td><strong>( )</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong> <strong>( )</strong></td>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> <strong>( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to these development plans. The proposed 400 houses, 7000 m2 industrial development, slip roads and junction from the A3 is very much over what the small villages of Send and Ripley can handle. This is lovely countryside in a green belt area, the developments and junction would route heavy traffic from the A3 and M25 through to Woking; the area would become a traffic jam, completely spoiling it. The village medical centre and school would also be overwhelmed. The proposed developments have also not previously been subjected to public consultation. Surely Guildford Borough Council need to follow the correct process here and conduct a full consultation under Regulation 18. The process appears invalid.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1486</th>
<th>Respondent: 15326369 / J D W Todd</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td><strong>( )</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong> <strong>( )</strong></td>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> <strong>( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT

Policy A43A

A new 4-way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common would be disastrous for Send. Send Road (A247) would be gridlocked all day. Send would be the through route to Woking for traffic leaving the M25 and A3, the proposed 2,000 houses at Wisley and the 2,000 houses at Burpham. However a 4 way interchange might alleviate the traffic through Ripley which already approaches levels when it was a trunk road (A3) before the Ripley bypass was built. However if the developments in the draft plan were to go ahead any such gain would be negated and the A247 through Send grid locked with risk to children attending the new Send Schools. Further as shown the off slip road to the southbound A3 would increase the traffic at the junction with the A247, already a the scene of many accidents.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1491</th>
<th>Respondent: 15326465 / James Parker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td><strong>( )</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong> <strong>( )</strong></td>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> <strong>( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
5. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5445</th>
<th>Respondent: 15326817 / Peter Jennings-Giles</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to policy A43.30 the development of new four way interchange onto the A3 which would mean that narrow Send Road (A247) would be the main route for traffic leaving the M25 and A3. It is already crowded and vulnerable to traffic jams. Further traffic from this development would result in permanent gridlock. It simply would not work.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1531</th>
<th>Respondent: 15329345 / Robin Hurst</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the creation of the new north and southbound slip roads to and from the A3.

I live on Clandon Road, and worked in and around Ripley since the late 80’s. The major bottle neck is Send Village, which this plan will on exacerbate.

The danger is the off slip going North at Burnt Common that again this will exacerbate with more people using it.

I went to the Public Consultation on Tuesday 21 June 2016, at East Horsley Village Hall between 12noon and 8pm. I met a gentleman called Martin from Highways

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1535</th>
<th>Respondent: 15329441 / Suzie Powell-Cullingford</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I OBJECT to Policy A43a provision of northbound and southbound on/off ramps to/from A3 at Burnt Common. Again there has been no Regulation 18 consultation on this policy site. The whole area surrounding the new A3 access will be a traffic congestion hotspot, with no possibility of relief or mitigation due to the narrow roads leading to Burnt Common from Clandon, Horsleys, Send, Ripley and Woking. These narrow roads cannot be improved, many are small country lanes, and most are already massively congested at peak times. In addition, the A3 itself is always hugely congested in both directions, from M25 J10 to beyond the A3/A31 junction south of Guildford. Highways England already refer to this stretch of the A3 as being at peak capacity, without the addition of thousands of extra cars, as a result of any or all of the strategic sites in the Local Plan being developed. The addition of an additional two way ramp at Burnt Common will not improve this situation and will most likely cause even further backlog on the small local road network.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3522  Respondent: 15329441 / Suzie Powell-Cullingford  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the quiet hamlet of Burnt common being turned into a traffic junction.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1539  Respondent: 15329537 / J Sweby  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the quiet hamlet of Burnt common being turned into a traffic junction.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1558  Respondent: 15340929 / Claire Smylie  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1623  Respondent: 15341985 / William Walker  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

3. I OBJECT to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common, because Send would have to try and then cope with traffic from the proposed 2000 new houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham and 1830 at Blackwell Farm. Traffic on this section of the A3 is already at a standstill during rush hour periods, and all such additional traffic would then flow through send road which is already overloaded. This must be avoided.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1658  Respondent: 15342401 / M.J. Harris  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common. The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from ondon/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.
This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1637  **Respondent:** 15342465 / Evelyn Walker  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

3. I OBJECT to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common, because Send would have to try and then cope with traffic from the proposed 2000 new houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham and 1830 at Blackwell Farm. Traffic on this section of the A3 is already at a standstill during rush hour periods, and all such additional traffic would then flow through Send road which is already overloaded. This must be avoided.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1647  **Respondent:** 15342529 / Lesley Peed  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because Send would have to take traffic from the proposed 2000 new houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm. Much of this traffic to and from the A3, M25, Woking and Guildford would go through Send. Send Road, which is already overloaded, would become gridlocked. Noise and pollution levels, already at excessive levels, would worsen. This must be avoided.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1651  **Respondent:** 15342753 / Mike Milne  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to policy A43a

We do not need a an on/off ramp at Burnt Common. This will not alleviate the traffic in the local area. In fact quite the opposite it will increase the traffic problems in the area.
A south bound slip road onto the A3 at the Ripley roundabout could ease the traffic situation. The area for this slip road was made available when the Ripley bypass was originally built but the slip road was never put in.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1680  Respondent: 15344641 / Ann Court  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

5 I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common very strongly.

The traffic now if there is a problem on the M25 or A3 is horrendous through the villages of Ripley, Send Marsh and Send and we become grid locked with traffic

finding alternative routes out of the congestion.

The roads are not capable of taking on all the extra volume of large lorries which is what would happen.

We had to have an Air Ambulance land on Send Marsh Green last week for an accident and part of our road was closed diverting bus and large vehicles around the Green

causing havoc, we cannot support all this extra traffic, its spoiling our lovely English Villages here in Surrey.

Lets not ruin our lovely countryside when there are a lot of Brown Sites to consider first... WE DONT WANT TO BE JOINED TO GUILDFORD , WOKING etc.

What consideration has been taken for Drs, Schools, Colleges, Transport Leisure etc.?

All these things require a car, bus, train, coach which again add to the volume of traffic at rush hours.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1721  Respondent: 15345281 / Alexandra Murphy  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.
The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1722</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 15346817 / Valerie Mead</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I strongly object to the proposal on the following lines :-</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed Ramp at Burnt Common on to the A3 would increase the already high density traffic flow along the A247 from Burnt Common roundabout towards West Clandon and would cause more problems from noise and pollution for homes in the vicinity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the moment traffic speeds along the A247 making joining it for residents at peak times extremely difficult.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1754</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 15348033 / Peter Nicholas</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The additional north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be very detrimental for local communities as it would draw in a huge amount of through traffic. The route from London/M25 to Woking or would become through Burnt Common and Send. Equally, traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc.) and the A25 would increasingly go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment ID: PSLPS16/1778  Respondent:  15348481 / Donna Styles  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

3. I OBJECT TO – the On and Off ramp at Burnt Common/Clandon Site A43a – this will only add to existing traffic problems in the villages.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1806  Respondent:  15349281 / Steve Aptel  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition of north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6520  Respondent:  15349281 / Steve Aptel  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

The addition of north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1823  Respondent: 15350081 / Tania Parslow  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

Thirdly, I object to the new interchange at Burnt Common with the A3 because of its impact on the village of Send. Send would absorb additional traffic from the proposed 2000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 at Gosden Hill and 1850 at Blackwell Farm. Send Road is already highly congested at peak times in particular and would not have the capacity to increase traffic load further. There would also be increase in noise and pollution in the village as a result.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1841  Respondent: 15350689 / Brian Peed  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because Send would have to take traffic from the proposed 2000 new houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm. Much of this traffic to and from the A3, M25, Woking and Guildford would go through Send. Send Road, which is already overloaded, would become gridlocked. Noise and pollution levels, already at excessive levels, would worsen. This must be avoided.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1856  Respondent: 15351873 / Magaret Winborn  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT TO the on and off ramp at site A43a Burnt Common/ Clandon Road. This will cause the traffic to be railroaded through the villages and result in increased traffic problems.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1936  Respondent: 15356385 / Mervyn Plumtree  Agent:
I object to site A43a the on and off ramp at Burnt Common/Clandon - this will increase traffic problems in the villages, not help them.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1940  Respondent: 15356513 / Anthony Gatford  Agent: Tony Gatford

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

3. I OBJECT to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common, because Send would have to try and then cope with traffic from the proposed 2000 new houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham and 1830 at Blackwell Farm. Traffic on this section of the A3 is already at a standstill during rush hour periods, and all such additional traffic would then flow through Send road which is already overloaded. This must be avoided.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1952  Respondent: 15356801 / Clare Harlow  Agent: 

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

16. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of 'through' traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

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

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common, because Send would have to try and then cope with traffic from the proposed 2000 new houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham and 1830 at Blackwell Farm. Traffic on this section of the A3 is already at a standstill during rush hour periods, and all such additional traffic would then flow through Send road which is already overloaded. This must be avoided.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1962  Respondent: 15357441 / Richard Hunt  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. This would be the end of the three villages as we know it. The interchange would make a cut through from Wisley Airfield (2000 houses) and the 400 houses at Burnt Common making Ripley and Send into a town traffic congestion area.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1968  Respondent: 15357697 / Ros Reeves  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the planned new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common as this would make the already crowded local roads completely gridlocked. Together with the proposed 2000 houses at Wisley Airfield, the 2000 houses at Gosden Hill Burpham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm, as well as the 400 proposed for Garlick's Arch, all traffic would have to travel through Send Village and local roads which are already overloaded.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1990  Respondent: 15358305 / Frances Hodgson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

1. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)
North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2007</th>
<th>Respondent: 15358625 / Ron Best</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object also to the proposed new interchange at Burnt Common which is a knock-on effect of the Garlick’s Arch development. Anyone who watches the flow of traffic along Send Barns Lane and Send Marsh Road as things are at the moment will quickly realise that the additional traffic attracted to slip-roads for the new interchange will cause major traffic jams and pollution on our already overcrowded roads. During the rush hours (and the 'school run'), the result will be grid-lock.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2043</th>
<th>Respondent: 15359905 / John Burns</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object the inclusion of new slip roads for access to the A3 at Burnt common(A43a). No mention of who is going to foot the considerable bill for these Trunk road access point additions; as they are being proposed purely to service the extra traffic brought about by the proposed new developments, then it follows that the tax payer should not have to pay, the developers should.

Trust that these submissions will be acknowledged and duly considered accordingly.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2170</th>
<th>Respondent: 15370497 / Edward Scott</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)
The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of 'through' traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Glandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2166  Respondent: 15370529 / J Wells  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

5. I OBJECT to the new interchange with the A3 at Burnt The traffic from the proposed 2000 new houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham & 1850 at Blackwell Farm (total of 5850 across the three sites) will be using Send Road, Send and will cause gridlock as already this road is overloaded. The noise & pollution, already excessive, would worsen to untenable levels and must be avoided at all cost.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2174  Respondent: 15370689 / C.E. Phillips  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

5. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at BurntCommon.

The addition of a new on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster in the making. There is no requirement to access the A3 in this location.

Any new A3 access/exit could be at the Ripley end of the A247. The existing on/off ramps could be upgraded to make two more ramps, one to exit the A3 North bound the other to access the A3 South bound. This addition will increase the flow of traffic through both Send and Ripley, which are both suffering from traffic congestion or Upgrade the A3100 Clay Lane access at Burpham.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6559  Respondent: 15371809 / Susan Pengilly  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Hence a further **major objection** to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common.

This would take traffic from the proposed 2000 new houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 at Gosden Hill Burnham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm. Much of this traffic to and from the A3, M25, Woking and Guildford would go through Send. Send Road, which is already overloaded, would become gridlocked. Noise and pollution levels, already at excessive levels, would worsen.

I would appreciate if the Planning Inspectorate can be made fully aware of my objections and would request confirmation that you have received this communication.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2198  **Respondent:** 15372417 / P. Mew  **Agent:**

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

1. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Glandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2202  **Respondent:** 15373153 / C R Woodland  **Agent:**

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the 2016 draft local plan for the following reasons:

I object to the local plan as the development proposed is not sustainable. The number of houses to be built per year is too high, firstly this should be constrained by infrastructure, for example a number of schools are at capacity already, secondly the overall requirement should be reviewed in the light of the recent referendum decision for the UK to leave the EU.
In particular I object to the late inclusion of sit A43 Garlicks Arch. This is a green field site with productive agricultural land and ancient woodland. For the development which is proposed the previous A43 site at Burnt Common was much more suitable, with land which is currently unused.

I support in principle the idea of a new junction with access to and from the A3 in both directions somewhere between Burpham and Burnt Common, however the correct place for this is near to site A25 Gosden Hill Farm, using both sides of the Portsmouth Road dual carriageway to access the new junction from Bumi Common roundabout.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2204</th>
<th>Respondent: 15373313 / Hugo Holden</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2210</th>
<th>Respondent: 15377473 / Deborah Holden</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2273</th>
<th>Respondent: 15382529 / Reuben Lee</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)
The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2321  **Respondent:** 15385281 / Daniel Tarrant  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object Policy A43a, the North facing slip road to from A3 at Send Marsh/Burnt Common

On the grounds of the increase in traffic flow. Our roads already strain to cope with existing levels of traffic. Especially all the approach roads to the A3, and in particular the A247 to and from the Burnt Common roundabout. Which passes a school, a Doctors surgery and goes straight through the centre of Send, linking Guildford and Woking. The A247 is 2 way road and not suitable for the high levels and heavy traffic this will create.

I object because GBC’s Transport Assessment was not available to Councillors for the vote taken on 24th May for these proposals. It was published on 6th June! Infrastructure requirements must be assessed before major proposals can be voted on.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2340  **Respondent:** 15385985 / Sally Almeida  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

3) I Object To site A43a the on and off ramp at Burntcommon/Clandon-this will increase traffic problems in the villages, not help them.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2355  **Respondent:** 15388385 / Linda Bagnall  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object Policy A43a, the North facing slip road to from A3 at Send Marsh/Burnt Common

On the grounds of the increase in traffic flow. Our roads already strain to cope with existing levels of traffic. Especially all the approach roads to the A3, and in particular the A247 to and from the Burnt Common roundabout. Which passes a school, a Doctors surgery and goes straight through the centre of Send, linking Guildford and Woking. The A247 is 2 way road and not suitable for the high levels and heavy traffic this will create.

I object because GBC’s Transport Assessment was not available to Councillors for the vote taken on 24th May for these proposals. It was published on 6th June! Infrastructure requirements must be assessed before major proposals can be voted on.

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

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2357</th>
<th>Respondent: 15388641 / Eva Hay</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>--</strong> I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2363</th>
<th>Respondent: 15388865 / Andrew Powell-Cullingford</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because it would mean that Send and the (A247) would be completely gridlocked all day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25 making the local roads hazardous for pedestrians and cyclists. There are hardly any pavements and very few cycle lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the huge extra amount of traffic ensuing would compromise the air quality, sound quality and light quality to all residents in Send.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3577</th>
<th>Respondent: 15388865 / Andrew Powell-Cullingford</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (site A43a)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the two new on and off ramps from the A3 at Burnt Common and the possibility of ASP3 to formulate a four way on-off system in order to enable access to and from the A3 for site A25 Gosden Hill. There will be an enormous impact upon both Ripley, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Send as this new ramp system will draw in a huge amount of through traffic from surrounding areas including Woking and the outer reaches of Guildford Borough via Clandon and Horsleys.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (site A43a).

I object to the two new on and off ramps from the A3 at Burnt Common and the possibility of ASP3 to formulate a four way on-off system in order to enable access to and from the A3 for site A25 Gosden Hill. There will be an enormous impact upon both Ripley, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Send as this new ramp system will draw in a huge amount of through traffic from surrounding areas including Woking and the outer reaches of Guildford Borough via Clandon and Horsleys.

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

Attached documents:

---

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common. I can't see any reliable evidence that local transport and roads can accommodate the increase in traffic. While the roads immediately adjacent to the interchange may appear to have some capacity the route through Send over the River Wey and into Old Woking (A247) does not! This road is already heavily congested and would be considerably worse.

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

Attached documents:

---

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an afterthought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

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

Attached documents:

---
I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2378  Respondent: 15389185 / M. Patrick  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2379  Respondent: 15389217 / B.J. Blair  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2381  Respondent: 15389249 / Michael Dixey  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

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

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/2382  Respondent: 15389281 / Anthony Smith  Agent:

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

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2385  Respondent: 15389345 / Peter Reynolds  Agent:

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

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2407  Respondent: 15390273 / Roderick Hutchison  Agent:

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

I object to the new A3 interchange at Burnt Common. The roads around Send are already congested; already at peak times it is difficult to safely turn out of Boughton Hall Avenue onto the Portsmouth Road, and the proposed development is likely to result in near-permanent gridlock at Burnt Common. In addition, the road through Clandon is unsuitable for large vehicles: I have seen several 'near misses' as lorries come round narrow bends straddling the middle of the road. The inevitable increase in commercial traffic would make these roads far more dangerous.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2403  Respondent: 15390337 / Daniel Smith  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2411  Respondent: 15390369 / Lewis Thorpe  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

Policy A43/A43a - I strongly object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common as this would gen a huge volume of traffic through the village. It is already congested during rush hours especilly with the school on Send Barnes Road. When the northbound lanes of the A3 are congested both in the morning and evening rush hours (which is most weekdays) Send Village is totally congested and then many local drivers speed down country lanes (Potters Lane) to avoid Send Road/Send Barnes Road and drive dangerously. Additional traffic will only exaggerate the situation.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2431  Respondent: 15391329 / Marian Tarrant  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object Policy A43a, the North facing slip road to from A3 at Send Marsh/Burnt Common

On the grounds of the increase in traffic flow. Our roads already strain to cope with existing levels of traffic. Especially all the approach roads to the A3, and in particular the A247 to and from the Burnt Common roundabout. Which passes a school, a Doctors surgery and goes straight through the centre of Send, linking Guildford and Woking. The A247 is 2 way road and not suitable for the high levels and heavy traffic this will create.

I object because GBC’s Transport Assessment was not available to Councillors for the vote taken on 24th May for these proposals. It was published on 6th June! Infrastructure requirements must be assessed before major proposals can be voted on.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2430  Respondent: 15391361 / Paul Thorpe  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2441</th>
<th>Respondent: 15391681 / Martin Pope</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strongly object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common as this would generate a huge volume of traffic through the village. It is already congested during rush hours especially with the school on Send Barnes Road. When the northbound lanes of the A3 are congested both in the morning and evening rush hours (which is most weekdays) Send Village is totally congested and then many local drivers speed down country lanes (Potters Lane) to avoid Send Road/Send Barnes Road and drive dangerously. Additional traffic will only exaggerate the situation.</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2446</th>
<th>Respondent: 15391905 / Geoff Gear</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2450</th>
<th>Respondent: 15397505 / Andrew Krisson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to a 4 way interchange on the A3 at Burnt Common as this would be catastrophic for Send as this would be the through route to Woking from the M25 and A3. With additional traffic from the proposed 2000 houses at Wisley and also 2000 at Burpham, Send cannot and must not take this.</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

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

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of 'through' traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Secondly, I object to the Burnt Common A3 interchange. As a current resident of Clandon Road, when I leave for work at 6.40am, this road is already busy and I often either have to wait for a considerable period of time to get out of my drive or alternatively turn left out of my house, drive to the roundabout and turn around. The lack of visibility, volume of traffic and potential pollution risks make this an unviable option. There is also the very real risk that building an interchange will ensure that traffic that wants to travel from A3 to Woking will go off this junction through Send and Old Woking, roads that are already at capacity and cannot be improved.

On top of that, I also see first-hand on a daily basis that from 6.45am the A3 from Ripley to M25 is grid-locked. Further development at Wisley Airfield, Gosden Hill and Blackwell Farm will make a bad problem much worse and that won’t be alleviated at all by building an interchange at Burnt Common. This should not happen.

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

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/2478  Respondent: 15399041 / Sue Ely  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved and negative impact on air quality and the health and safety of pedestrians and cyclists and increase noise pollution.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2504  Respondent: 15400641 / Anne Barker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2520  Respondent: 15400897 / Alison Parkinson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because Send Village is already gridlocked in the morning and evening and this development would mean the village would have to take a huge weight of additional traffic which is absolutely ridiculous to even contemplate!

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2530  Respondent: 15400961 / Joan Plumtree  Agent:
I object to site A43a the on and off ramp at Burnt Common/Clandon- this will increase traffic problems in the villages, not help them.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2532  Respondent: 15401281 / James Fowler  Agent:

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

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2572  Respondent: 15406593 / Guy Whatley  Agent:

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

I object to the proposed new slip roads for the A3. Traffic is very bad in the village and on many surrounding roads at most times of the day. Please do not make it even worse. Pollution from traffic fumes has been known to affect the health of the vulnerable, yet there seems to be no plans to alleviate any issues that will arrive from such an increase in the number of cars and lorries on the road to serve these houses and businesses.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2584  Respondent: 15407681 / Emily Holden  Agent:

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

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2594</th>
<th>Respondent: 15407937 / Lyn Freeland</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to a new A3 interchange at Burnt Common which will generate considerable traffic volumes on to an already overloaded road network, bringing commuter traffic to a standstill and massively increasing air and noise pollution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7510</th>
<th>Respondent: 15418849 / Sarah Smith</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the A3 intersection at Burnt Common because the traffic along Send Barnes Lane from the traffic lights is already overstretched on a regular basis. The traffic are often gridlocked with traffic backing up from the Burnt Common roundabout all the way back into Send. It can take 15 - 20 minutes to drive less than half a mile some mornings to get from Send to Burnt Common. I walk a lot and the car fumes are horrible, not to mention the noise not just from engines but from car horns of disgruntled motorists from the endless queuing. Often the lights change and nothing has moved at all.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7515</th>
<th>Respondent: 15419489 / Janet Drew</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. This would send much more traffic which currently bypasses Ripley village through narrow roads, particularly Polesden Lane, which is partially single track and already a nightmare to traverse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7526</th>
<th>Respondent: 15419713 / Russell Woods</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because Send would have to take traffic from the proposed 2000 new houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm. Send Road is all ready overloaded and increase in traffic from A3, M25, Woking and Guildford would become gridlocked with noise pollution levels increasing which are already very high. This must be avoided.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2730  Respondent: 15421633 / Julia Cogan  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common. I believe it would be disastrous for Send. The Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable but, even so, shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25. The A247 already suffers from over loading so any additional traffic would be disastrous and we may well have a situation where we are gridlocked regularly through the day. Traffic tail backs are already easily triggered either towards Old Woking or through Send to Burnt Common - any additional traffic to and from the A3 would result in these queues stretching in both directions through the length of Send.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2742  Respondent: 15422145 / Orlando Lee  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:
Secondly, I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. I assume this has been included to appease objectors to the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield, Gosden Hill and Blackwell Farm. As someone who lives directly by this new interchange I’d like to tell you what the traffic is like presently. I can not turn right out of my drive during rush hour due to the amount of traffic and lack of visibility. This requires me to turn left and then go around the Burnt Common roundabout before I can properly start my journey. The footpath stops on one side of the road and then continues on the other side exactly where you plan to put in a slip road. It is dangerous enough crossing here without any additional traffic. My other concern regarding this interchange is about how many people will then use the smaller country roads to access the new junction. These are not built to handle excessive traffic. The noise levels and pollution along the Clandon Road are already high and this will only get worse. Think about the health of residents and recent studies which suggest high levels of pollution cause one in three strokes.

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

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The proposed north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is minimal requirement for existing local traffic to access and egress the A3 to the north save to mitigate loads through Ripley, but the addition could draw in a huge amount of 'through' traffic. There has been no impact assessment for this last minute inclusion.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:
I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because all the traffic from the proposed new 2000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 houses at Godsen Hill, Burpham, and 1850 at Blackwell Farm would be directed via Send. Send is already overloaded and would become gridlocked. Noise and pollution levels would worsen.

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

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

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

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

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

Attached documents:
1. I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. With the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield, Gosden Hill, Burpham and Blackwell Farm will bring gridlock.

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

Attached documents:

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. With the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield, Gosden Hill, Burpham and Blackwell Farm will bring gridlock.

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

Attached documents:

** I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

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

Attached documents:

. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)
The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2944</th>
<th>Respondent: 15430433 / Simon Greenhill</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2946</th>
<th>Respondent: 15430497 / Martin Chalk</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3002</th>
<th>Respondent: 15433569 / Jennifer Beddoes</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England’s consent.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3052</th>
<th>Respondent: 15434241 / Valerie Sowerby</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3047</td>
<td>Respondent: 15434273 / Brian Crosby</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/3055 | Respondent: 15434433 / James Collins | Agent: |
| Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |
| 1. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a) |
| On/Off ramps for the A3 at Burnt Common will result in a huge additional traffic burden on all the associated villages by providing access to Woking and Dorking/leatherhead via Clandon |
| What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? |
| Attached documents: |

<p>| Comment ID: PSLPS16/3080 | Respondent: 15436353 / Diana Smith | Agent: |
| Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |
| I object lo new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent. |
| What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? |
| Attached documents: |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3081</th>
<th>Respondent: 15436801 / Simon Smith</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt common because of the increase in local traffic including from the proposed 2000 new houses at Wisley Airfield. Additional local traffic would affect the already busy Portsmouth Road and particularly Send Road which is often at gridlock already during peak times.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3094</th>
<th>Respondent: 15437089 / Jamie Manester</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common - I object to this proposal as the increase in traffic would be devastating to Send. Send is already overloaded with traffic and is already frequently gridlocked! An increase in volume of traffic would have an adverse effect on the environment from air and noise pollution, resulting in poorer quality of life!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3097</th>
<th>Respondent: 15437505 / Terri Smart</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Highway Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the inclusion of land for new on/off slip roads at Burnt Common. These would draw in a huge amount of 'through' traffic from the area and funnel it through the A247 through West Clandon and or the Ripley Road from East Clandon via HM Prison Ripley and Tithe Barns Road. Both these routes are narrow and dangerous and the addition of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
traffic to them to gain/leave A3 access would be seriously detrimental to both villages, in terms of road safety, road damage and air pollution.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3109  Respondent: 15437793 / Paul Hester  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• New north and southbound slip-roads to and from the A3 (policy A43a)

The Clandon Road once was a quiet road. Now the traffic starts to build up each day in the early hours and I am regularly woken by the sound of traffic (even with the benefit of double glazing) at just after 5.00 am. This is now, what will be the position once additional traffic is encouraged to use the new slip roads? Once there was the all-day breakfast now will we have the all-day traffic jam?

The A247 hasn't much more capacity so more vehicles will equal more congestion. Working in Ripley I used to be able, with a slight delay, to make a right turn into the A247 out from where I live in Woodlands. Now I have to make a detour in order to avoid this manoeuvre as it has become progressively more difficult due to the numbers of vehicles using the road.

Many cyclists use the road. It is quite narrow with little or no scope to be widened. I have safety concerns that when cars are held back they tend to travel a little faster in order to make up for lost time and if a cyclist happens to be in the way ....

Petrol and diesel cars have one thing in common, when static in jams, they pollute. Has appropriate research been undertaken to consider the effects on our health? If not why not?

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1335  Respondent: 15438049 / David A Sprigings  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. Noise levels are already excessive, and local roads, many narrow, would become grid-locked.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3129  Respondent: 15439425 / Abigail Cruse  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3139</th>
<th>Respondent: 15439425 / Abigail Cruse</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3158</th>
<th>Respondent: 15440353 / Alison Boyce</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3165</th>
<th>Respondent: 15440513 / Alexandra Gordon</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The creation of new north and southbound slip roads to and from the A3 to the A247 Clandon Road (Policy A43A) at Burnt Common.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3182 **Respondent:** 15440993 / Rebecca Woods  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I OBJECT to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because Send would have to take traffic from the proposed 2000 new houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm. Send Road is all ready overloaded and increase in traffic from A3, M25, Woking and Guildford would become gridlocked with noise pollution levels increasing which are already very high. This must be avoided.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3227 **Respondent:** 15442561 / Tegan Meredith  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

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

I object to a new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because Send is already gridlocked daily at typical rush hour times and hasn’t the road infrastructure to cope with any more traffic.

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because Send would then be used as a cut through to the A3 and the M25. Already Send Marsh Road is being used as a cut through to Ripley/A3 and is causing daily congestion at peak times. Very heavy traffic would cause daily chaos and bring the surrounding roads to a standstill.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3239 **Respondent:** 15442785 / Tammy Hoar  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because Send would have to take traffic from the proposed 2000 new houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm. Much of this traffic to and fro the A3, M25, Woking and Guildford would go through Send. Send Road, which is already
overloaded, would become gridlocked. Noise and pollution levels, already at excessive levels, would worsen. THIS MUST BE AVOIDED.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3263  Respondent: 15443265 / C Knaggs  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the new interchange area . Already too much congestion.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3274  Respondent: 15445729 / Daren Aris  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to a new interchange and slip road with the A3 at Burntcommon because Send and Ripley will have to cope with a huge influx of traffic on roads which are already overloaded.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3278  Respondent: 15445793 / Jackie Withers  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.
**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3296  **Respondent:** 15446561 / Peter Hoar  **Agent:** 
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a 
**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. It is extremely difficult to access Send Road and the Portsmouth Road in the early morning and evening closing times. With the proposed 2000 houses at Wisley, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill and 1850 at Blackwell Farm, Send faces gridlock.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3319  **Respondent:** 15446753 / David Boyce  **Agent:**
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

12. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition of north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of 'through' traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Glandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3322  **Respondent:** 15447873 / Karen Robinson  **Agent:**
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO NEW INTERCHANGE WITH A3 AT BURNT COMMON. The 5850 homes including Gosden Hill Burpham, wisely will derive more traffic through Send. Already excessive pollution, noise, flooding would worsen. Potter Lane’s traffic has already increased exponentially over last 20 years.
A few photographic examples. This is all very ill thought out. Councillors and politicians need to be better than this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5429  Respondent: 15448289 / Paul Miller  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3372  Respondent: 15448897 / Ruth Brothwell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common in its currently proposed form. There is no mention of improvements to local road infrastructure as a dependency on this proposal. Local roads through Send and Ripley are already heavily congested with pipeline plans leading to further volumes. Traffic already queues at peak periods as existing roads can scarcely cope with the current levels of traffic. Please see below for more information relating to my object on this issue.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3416  Respondent: 15449857 / Fiona Cumberland  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3419</th>
<th>Respondent: 15449889 / Harriet Bell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</strong>, <strong>is Sound? ( )</strong>, <strong>is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3426</th>
<th>Respondent: 15449921 / James Herbst</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</strong>, <strong>is Sound? ( )</strong>, <strong>is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to a new interchange with A3 at Burnt Common as Send would have to take traffic from the proposed 2000 new houses at Wisley airfield, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm. Send Road which is already overloaded would become gridlocked with noise and pollution levels that is already excessive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3438</th>
<th>Respondent: 15449985 / Elizabeth Mead</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</strong>, <strong>is Sound? ( )</strong>, <strong>is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New North and South slip-roads to and from AJ to the A247 Clandon Road would generate considerably more traffic, pollution and noise through the A247 Clandon road, Send Village leading 10 Old Waking, along both roads which are already at capacity without any widening possibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We all understand that we need to build new houses within the borough, but all brownfield sites should first be used.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would also favour limited development on the old Wisley airfield providing connecting Country lanes are protected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3462</th>
<th>Respondent: 15450785 / Georgina Love</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)
The addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. The village roads will become more of a cut through than they already are.

This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition of north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3512  Respondent: 15451969 / Rosie Lee  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3606  Respondent: 15454465 / Marissa Draper  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to policy A43a proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3607  Respondent: 15454497 / Rick Parker  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I OBJECT to policy A43a proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3613</th>
<th>Respondent: 15454657 / Tracy McGuigan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to policy A43a proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3614</th>
<th>Respondent: 15454689 / Dave Herbert</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to policy A43a proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3615</th>
<th>Respondent: 15454785 / Fiona Hodges</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to policy A43a proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3616</th>
<th>Respondent: 15454849 / Charlotte Murphy</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section page number</th>
<th>Document page number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page 238 of 350</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. I OBJECT to policy A43a proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/3564  Respondent: 15454977 / Graham Hook  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to proposed new slip roads to the A3 even though I can see it might= make it easier for me at times, but for the area as a whole and local peopl= e it would make life and travel more than difficult.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3622  Respondent: 15455009 / Emma Graham  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to policy A43a proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3623  Respondent: 15455073 / Amanda Fletcher  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to policy A43a proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3624  Respondent: 15455105 / Kate Robinson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I OBJECT to policy A43a proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3612  Respondent: 15455201 / Edith Dadswell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3571  Respondent: 15455233 / Andrew Hamilton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3711  Respondent: 15457505 / Julie Gray  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)
The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no
requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.
The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east
of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense
damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.
This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section
18 consultation on this.
A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s
requirement of 2km
Furthermore this land is held in trust with Manorial rights and has no business being included.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3718  Respondent: 15457505 / Julie Gray  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

This again is a hugely important development which has suddenly appeared in the Local Plan.

If traffic is allowed to access the A3 northbound and exit it southbound it is likely to more than double the amount of
traffic using Send Road. This is without taking into account the traffic generated by the development of Wisley and
Gosden Hill.

There seems to be either a lack of understanding of the consequences of these sorts of developments and/or a total lack of
consideration for those of us who will suffer.

I object to this proposal.

It seems grossly unfair that Send has been targeted with so many unsuitable proposals which will fundamentally change
the whole nature of our village. Some of the proposals have been included at a very late stage, as some sort of
afterthought, without allowing a decent consultation period. It seems most unprofessional and I do question the reasoning
behind it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3758  Respondent: 15459297 / Mark Murphy  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to this proposed new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because much of the traffic to and from the
A3 , the M25 , Woking and Guildford would be going through to Send Road which is already at full capacity. It would be
total gridlock as this road funnels into a small roundabout and very small congested roads in Old Woking.
The proposed junction would have to take traffic from the proposed 2000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm, this would be a total disaster for the Village of Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4214</th>
<th>Respondent: 15460353 / Elizabeth Hewlett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a) North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved. What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3795</th>
<th>Respondent: 15461025 / Philip Masters</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposed on off ramp at Clandon as this will increase traffic problems in all surrounding villages and cause gridlock. What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3798</th>
<th>Respondent: 15461153 / Lynda Masters</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposed interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. Noise and pollution levels are already excessive and would almost certainly worsen. This would fundamentally change the area in detrimental way. What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/3806  | Respondent: 15461217 / S. Gilby  | Agent: |
I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition of north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of 'through' traffic. This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

I object to Policy A43.30 the proposed development of Garlicks Arch designated for 400 houses and an industrial estate. This is a new site not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted on previously. It is not only permanently protected green belt but also a site of ancient woodland with some trees planted in the 16th century.

I object to policy A43.30 the development of new four way interchange onto the A3 which would mean that narrow Send Road (A247) would be the main route for traffic leaving the M25 and A3. It is already crowded and vulnerable to traffic jams. Further traffic from this development would result in permanent gridlock. It simply would not work.

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3892</th>
<th>Respondent: 15462785 / Thomas McMinn</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The development of ramps at Burnt Common would mean that a far greater number of cars would access the villages from London/M25 to Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3930</th>
<th>Respondent: 15464673 / Trudy Grey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition of north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. **There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.**

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

** I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

** I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)
This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

** Comment ID: PSLPS16/3995  ** Respondent: 15468417 / A B Buchanan  ** Agent:  
** Document: ** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )  

I object to the proposal to build a 4 way interchange on the A3 at Burnt Common which will hugely increase traffic congestion in our village. All the Woking bowid traffic from the M25 and A3 will have to use minor roads through the heart of the Village and will be disastrous for our neighbourhood.  

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?  

Attached documents:

---

** Comment ID: PSLPS16/3993  ** Respondent: 15468609 / Lesley Lane  ** Agent:  
** Document: ** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )  

** I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)  

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.  

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?  

Attached documents:

---

** Comment ID: PSLPS16/3999  ** Respondent: 15468705 / Pauline East  ** Agent:  
** Document: ** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )  

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common, this would be disastrous for Send and the A247 which is already overloaded and jammed at peak times will become gridlocked. Already noise and pollution levels are excessive and this would certainly worsen to the point of being intolerable.  

Send would be taking traffic from the proposed new houses at Wisley, Gosden Hill,
Burpham and Blackwell Farm. Much of it would come through the village to and from the A3, M25, Woking and Guildford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4008  Respondent: 15468833 / Zoe Kollov  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Finally, I could not object more to the proposed new interchange with the A3, which will see Send taking additional traffic from a large number of additional site containing approximately 2000 new houses (at Wisley Airfield, Gosden hill, Burpham, Blackwell farm) . This would lead to a large proportion of the traffic for Guildford, Woking, the A3 and the M25 going through Send, which is not acceptable. We cannot have roads that are already fully loaded and necessary for the health and prosperity of the community gridlocked by this addition traffic, this is a green belt area, not a rat run.

The Green Belt is protection in law and there are no special circumstances why this should change in any way. Hands off the nations Green belt!!!!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4021  Respondent: 15468993 / Nicholas Brown  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the proposed new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common.

The previously mentioned Send Road is already overloaded at peak times and this proposal will increase traffic levels along with noise and pollution. The traffic that currently goes through Ripley at the moment will now funnel through Send - this is unacceptable. 2000 proposed homes at Wisley coupled with 2000 at Burpham will cause chaos. Gridlock through Send will follow.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4031  Respondent: 15469217 / L.Y. Jolliffe  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to a new A3 interchange at Burnt Common - this would increase the congestion through Send which is already overloaded with traffic at a standstill particularly throughout the rush hour periods. Cars queuing in this way omit toxic pollution to local residents and pedestrians.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4034  Respondent: 15469249 / Daniel Harris  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4073  Respondent: 15470145 / Linda Eyre  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition of north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/4085  Respondent: 15471489 / P Gilby  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4079  Respondent: 15472097 / Bernard Eyre  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition of north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Glandon and Burnt Common, This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4092  Respondent: 15472833 / Lorraine Ozanne  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common – Send would not be able to manage to take the traffic and noise and pollution levels would be excessive.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of 'through' traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4405  Respondent: 15483553 / Robert Bastable  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a) This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4409  Respondent: 15483713 / Claire Walker  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable. Also the village of West Clandon cannot sustain any more traffic through it as a short cut to Guildford. There has already been one instance of a child being knocked down by a car on The Street which is a residential road and the speed limit is not imposed here. Also the narrowness of the road in places makes it unsuitable and dangerous (pavement is not safe) with an increased flow in traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4455</th>
<th>Respondent: 15485473 / Eilish Smith</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)  
North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved. |
| What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? |
| Attached documents: |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4467</th>
<th>Respondent: 15485601 / Tim Jewers</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to site A43a the “on off” ramp at Burnt Common / Clandon, this will increase traffic and add another junction to an already dangerous and congested A3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4495</th>
<th>Respondent: 15486017 / Neil Higgins</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • I object to the creation of ramps to and from the A3 at Garlick’s Arch / Burnt Common (A43A). The local roads already cannot support the existing volume of traffic. The new ramps would generate significant additional flows upon local roads creating numerous rat runs as commuters strive to save additional time. This pressure would not just be felt by the A247 but by narrow lanes e.g. those around East Clandon and Tithebarns Lane in Send.  
• I object to a Local Plan which seeks to direct additional traffic onto roads (A247) which cannot be widened to accommodate the additional volume of traffic  
• I object to the creation of the ramps to and from the A3 at Garlick’s Arch / Burnt Common – These would generate additional noise to Local houses whilst significantly deteriorating the quality of air  
• I object to the creation of ramps to and from the A3 at Garlick’s Arch / Burnt Common since these would generate significant safety risks to those living in the immediate vicinity of the planned ramps (Tithebarns Lane) together with pedestrians, cyclists and other users of Tithebarns Lane – including staff and visitors to HMP Send. |
<p>| What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? |
| Attached documents: |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4500</th>
<th>Respondent: 15486081 / Rosie Ainsworth</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( )</td>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong> ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4511</th>
<th>Respondent: 15486177 / Daniel Peyton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( )</td>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong> ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4522</th>
<th>Respondent: 15486305 / Noel Ainsworth</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( )</td>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong> ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4538</th>
<th>Respondent: 15486849 / Eric Waestaff</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( )</td>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong> ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4617  Respondent: 15486881 / Mark Langton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4614  Respondent: 15486913 / Sarah Langton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4613  Respondent: 15486945 / J Hazelton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/4544  Respondent: 15486977 / P Jefferson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4594  Respondent: 15487009 / Yvonne Peyton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4595  Respondent: 15487041 / S Comfy  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4596  Respondent: 15487105 / Keith Pew  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4597  Respondent: 15487137 / P Doherty  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4598  Respondent: 15487169 / Emily Wigfall  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4599  Respondent: 15487201 / Samantha Dale  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4562</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 15487233 / Lindsey Schravetta</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4601</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 15487265 / Helen Smith</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4566</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 15487297 / L.A. Crane</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to policy A43.30 the development of new four way interchange onto the A3 which would mean that narrow Send Road (A247) would be the main route for traffic leaving the M25 and A3. It is already crowded and vulnerable to traffic jams. Further traffic from this development would result in permanent gridlock. It simply would not work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4602</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 15487329 / Adam Sadler</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4603  Respondent: 15487361 / Roger Dean  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4605  Respondent: 15487393 / Nicola Ford  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4606  Respondent: 15487425 / B Pryor  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4607</th>
<th>Respondent: 15487457 / Aidan Beckett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>, is Sound?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4608</th>
<th>Respondent: 15487489 / Luke Draper</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>, is Sound?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4571</th>
<th>Respondent: 15487521 / A Malcmer</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>, is Sound?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4609</th>
<th>Respondent: 15487553 / Nicholas Eager</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>, is Sound?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4956  Respondent: 15495393 / M Rendell  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4957  Respondent: 15495457 / R Laroche  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4744  Respondent: 15495489 / Stephen Hill  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4752  Respondent: 15495585 / Cristiano Vitor De Oliveira  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4958  Respondent: 15495617 / Peter Elliot  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---

I object to policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4757  Respondent: 15495649 / Stephen Cruse  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.
This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4959  Respondent: 15495681 / Pippa Mathews  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4966  Respondent: 15495777 / Michael Lowe  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4762  Respondent: 15495809 / Katie Critchlow  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4973  Respondent: 15496001 / Ryan Hookind  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4975  Respondent: 15496033 / Sophie Hart  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4783  Respondent: 15496129 / Ella Doyle  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4977</th>
<th>Respondent: 15496193 / Oliver Hemmings</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( )</td>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong> ( )</td>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4978</th>
<th>Respondent: 15496225 / Tasha Hemmings</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( )</td>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong> ( )</td>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4979</th>
<th>Respondent: 15496257 / Charlotte Philipps</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( )</td>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong> ( )</td>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4980</th>
<th>Respondent: 15496289 / W.A. McGregor</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( )</td>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong> ( )</td>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4974</th>
<th>Respondent: 15497505 / Jyoti Nanda</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4856</th>
<th>Respondent: 15497537 / Caroline Sheppard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4865</th>
<th>Respondent: 15497601 / Ben Hicks</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4884</th>
<th>Respondent: 15497761 / N Wadey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4935</th>
<th>Respondent: 15498241 / Faye Church</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4944</th>
<th>Respondent: 15498369 / Kris Steadman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4969</th>
<th>Respondent: 15498785 / Catherine Elingworth</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5003</th>
<th>Respondent: 15499873 / Pan Illingworth</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at BurntCommon (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of 'through' traffic.

I already live on a busy road. This will have a very negative impact on my family's (and other residents) health and wellbeing, including not being able to sleep at night due to increased traffic. This is going to affect our quality of life!

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Glandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5040  Respondent: 15500801 / Morgan Schooling  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5052  Respondent: 15501217 / Luke Sarti  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5070  Respondent: 15501313 / Matthew Dougherty  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5078</th>
<th>Respondent: 15502049 / Paul Marshall</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5093</th>
<th>Respondent: 15502177 / Steve Plewis</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5099</th>
<th>Respondent: 15502305 / S. Gibbs</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7869</th>
<th>Respondent: 15502433 / Jill Murphy</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to this proposed new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because much of the traffic to and from the A3, the M25, Woking and Guildford would be going through to Send Road which is already at full capacity. It would be total gridlock as this road funnels into a small roundabout and very small congested roads in Old Woking. The proposed junction would have to take traffic from the proposed 2000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm, this would be a total disaster for the Village of Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5117  Respondent: 15502817 / Linda Margaret Cutbush  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a) North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5126  Respondent: 15502977 / Alexandra Morton  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5160  Respondent: 15503105 / Beml Evans  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5231  Respondent: 15503809 / M Pratt  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO the on and off ramps (site A43a) at Burnt Common – which will serve only to increase traffic problems in Ripley, Send, Burnt Common etc, as through traffic uses local roads as ‘rat runs’ in order to access the A3 and M25. Traffic is already gridlocked during busy times and existing roads are narrow, at times impassable and totally unsuitable for heavier traffic levels.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5285  Respondent: 15504833 / Robert Lynch  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common - Much of the extra traffic generated by new housing developments at Wisley, Gosden and and Guildford would go through Send, on Send Road - a narrow road already causing traffic delays. Extra traffic would cause gridlock, pollution and general amenity degradation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5312  Respondent: 15504929 / William Scott  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of 'through' traffic.

I already live on a busy road. This will have a very negative impact on my health and wellbeing.
The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5301  Respondent: 15504993 / Harry Eke  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• I OBJECT to Policy A43a (Land for North facing slip roads to/from A3 at send Marsh/Burnt Common) This would necessitate a 4-way junction at Burnt Common and would inevitably increase the amount of traffic using the local roads in Send. This junction would worsen the problem of drivers using Send as a cut through from Guildford to Woking on local roads that are just not intended for this purpose.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5318  Respondent: 15505313 / Samantha J S Perry  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a) North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. The addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic from London/M25 to Woking. This is not sustainable as these roads are already overloaded and have no scope to be improved. It will result in gridlock and would also cause appalling deterioration to the air quality.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5324  Respondent: 15505377 / Simon Wright  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/5330</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15505409 / Ian Cunningham</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/5337</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15505537 / Vincent Carley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/5343</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15505601 / Emma Robson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5427</th>
<th>Respondent: 15505761 / James McMarken</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5354</th>
<th>Respondent: 15505793 / Edward Goddard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5364</th>
<th>Respondent: 15505921 / Andrew Forest</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5370</th>
<th>Respondent: 15506049 / Mandy Shoesmith</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSLPS16/5428</td>
<td>15506081 / Dale Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSLPS16/5430</td>
<td>15506113 / Sheila Taylor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSLPS16/5381</td>
<td>15506177 / Jean Calas-Hathaway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5434</td>
<td>Respondent: 15506209 / Rosemary Richardson</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5436</th>
<th>Respondent: 15506305 / Pamela Sadler</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5397</th>
<th>Respondent: 15506369 / Sheila Jennings-Giles</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I OBJECT to policy A43.30 the development of new four way interchange onto the A3 which would mean that narrow Send Road (A247) would be the main route for traffic leaving the M25 and A3. It is already crowded and vulnerable to traffic jams. Further traffic from this development would result in permanent gridlock. It simply would not work.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5441</th>
<th>Respondent: 15506401 / Alicia Robinson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>****</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5406</th>
<th>Respondent: 15506657 / Teresa Laroche</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5437</th>
<th>Respondent: 15506881 / Chloe Brown</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5451</th>
<th>Respondent: 15506913 / Nicholas Mann</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5466</th>
<th>Respondent: 15506945 / Catherine Wyatt</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5483  Respondent: 15507105 / N. Hookins  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5499  Respondent: 15507329 / Manner Kaur  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5505  Respondent: 15507457 / Andre Rose  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5511</th>
<th>Respondent: 15507489 / K Garner</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) , is Sound? ( ) , is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes. What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5526</th>
<th>Respondent: 15507553 / David Lawton Garner</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) , is Sound? ( ) , is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td>I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a) North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved. What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5535</th>
<th>Respondent: 15507585 / Patrick Laroche</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) , is Sound? ( ) , is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes. What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5541</th>
<th>Respondent: 15507617 / Ewan Collens</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) , is Sound? ( ) , is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5550  Respondent: 15507649 / Nick Turner  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a). The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of 'through' traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

I object to the proposed Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C). The Infrastructure Schedule sets out the key infrastructure requirements on which the delivery of the plan depends. For each of the Key Allocated Sites in the borough it identifies infrastructure projects that are required, except for Garlick’s Arch (A43) which is not mentioned. It is clear that the Plan takes no account of the infrastructure required for this site and is therefore not fit for purpose.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5578  Respondent: 15507713 / Yvonne Connolly  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and Lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5577  Respondent: 15507745 / M Grainger  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and Lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5571</th>
<th>Respondent: 15507969 / Ian Draper</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and Lanes.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5570</th>
<th>Respondent: 15508001 / Lisa Barwick</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and Lanes.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5569</th>
<th>Respondent: 15508033 / D Worship</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and Lanes.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5568</th>
<th>Respondent: 15508065 / Christina Worship</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and Lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5592  Respondent: 15508353 / James Hawkey  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site 43a. This will increase traffic problems in the village

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5635  Respondent: 15509057 / Richard Golding  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, this additional junction on the A3 is within 2.5 miles of an existing junction. Junctions increase the risk of accidents with drivers leaving it late to get in the correct lane to leave a fast road, where as traffic joining effectively reduce the principal road by one lane. It will not improve the traffic flow on the local roads, it could even make it worse, as it could draw traffic from the south and southwest of Woking on to the A247 through Send to join the A3, where as they may use the Byfleet road to the A3 junction at Pains Hill This proposal is only there so the council can claim to be doing road infrastructure work to assist with traffic flows that all these proposed development will produce.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5670  Respondent: 15569505 / David Hawkey  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to site 43a. This will increase traffic problems in the village. A43a

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/5686  Respondent: 15570273 / Barnaby Geib  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5690  Respondent: 15570305 / Richard Gray  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5720  Respondent: 15571681 / Anne Martin  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a significant problem for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/ M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5739  Respondent: 15572097 / Jackie Wybrow  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common as this would increase the amount of traffic flowing through Send during the busy commuter hours and the streets are already gridlocked during these times so adding more traffic will compound the problem. I am very concerned about the increased levels of noise and air pollution that this increase in traffic will cause for the residents of Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7761  Respondent: 15573793 / Alan Ridley  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

New on/off ramps to the A3 would create an enormous amount of "through traffic", which would be dangerous, increase pollution and change the peaceful character of the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5763  Respondent: 15573921 / Carolyne Jackson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site A43a the on and off ramp at Burnt Common/Clandon - this will increase traffic problems in the villages, not help them

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5787  Respondent: 15574337 / Jacqueline Redknap  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause
immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved and negatively impact on air quality and the health and safety of pedestrians and cyclists and increase noise pollution.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard.

There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5793  
**Respondent:** 15574497 / Ann Murray  
**Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. Send would have to take traffic from other proposed sites - 2000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm. Send Road is already very busy. Noise and pollution levels would worsen.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5804  
**Respondent:** 15574913 / Peter David Sheppard  
**Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Finally, I do not consider the proposed new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common has been thought through sufficiently and that this should not be entertained until major improvements are made to the A3 to deal with the existing problems that occur morning and evening (most days now). Therefore I object to this part of the Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5823  
**Respondent:** 15575009 / Tony Redknap  
**Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.
The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved and negatively impact on air quality and the health and safety of pedestrians and cyclists and increase noise pollution.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard.

There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5829  **Respondent:** 15575201 / Richard Newman  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of Garlick’s Arch (Policy A43) and Land for new North facing slip roads to/from A3 (Policy A43a) on the grounds of suitability

The Garlick’s Arch site replaced the Burnt Common Nurseries site which was included in all previous drafts of the local plan and was allocated for industrial use and housing. Whereas the Garlick’s Arch site is Green Belt and the site has never been previously developed the Burnt Common Nurseries site has been previously developed and includes three industrial units totalling 50,000 square feet. This site was previously highlighted by Guildford Borough Council as key to meeting the industrial needs of the Borough.

The Burnt Common Nurseries site is also more deliverable and suitable given the scale of Send Village. There is mature screening around the Burnt Common Nurseries site, there are no pylons or flood risk and all ecology reports have been produced supporting the suitability of the site. There are also three existing access points to the site.

I object to the Land for new North facing slip roads to/from A3 (Policy A43a) on the grounds of funding

Appendix A Page 278 of the Local Plan states that the northbound and southbound slip roads will be developer funded at a cost of £10,000,000 each thus a total of £20,000,000. Clearly the developer of the 400 homes at Garlick’s Arch will not fund these alone. Is there any evidence that £20,000,000 can be raised to fund these slip roads from developers on top of all the other necessary infrastructure work?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5850  **Respondent:** 15575617 / Pete Killingley  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. Send is already rammed full of traffic during rush hour every day, and it only takes one set of traffic lights in Send, Old Woking, or Kingfield, and the entire of Send becomes gridlocked, taking half an hour to travel through the village. This is because the road system is already beyond its natural
capacity. To have a new four way interchange will only make this worse, and again is being done without regard for the village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5858  Respondent: 15575713 / Sophie Killingley  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. Send is already rammed full of traffic during rush hour every day, and it only takes one set of traffic lights in Send, Old Woking, or Kingfield, and the entire of Send becomes gridlocked, taking half an hour to travel through the village. This is because the road system is already beyond its natural capacity. To have a new four way interchange will only make this worse, and again is being done without regard for the village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5945  Respondent: 15579137 / Nicodemus Brian Rhyner  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5956  Respondent: 15579361 / Caroline May  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.
The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5973  Respondent: 15579649 / Peter E May  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

16.  I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6037  Respondent: 15582817 / Karsten Kollov  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Finally, I could not object more to the proposed new interchange with the A3, which will see Send taking additional traffic from a large number of additional site containing approximately 2000 new houses (at Wisley Airfield, Gosden hill, Burpham, Blackwell farm) . This would lead to a large proportion of the traffic for Guildford, Woking, the A3 and the M25 going through Send, which is not acceptable. We cannot have roads that are already fully loaded and necessary for the health and prosperity of the community gridlocked by this addition traffic, this is a green belt area, not a rat run.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5999  Respondent: 15583585 / Josephine Rooke  Agent:
**I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)**

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6109</th>
<th>Respondent: 15583681 / Laurence Pink</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT TO the A43a on off ramp at Clandon

THE A3 CAN'T COPE WITH THE TRAFFIC !!!!!!!

SEND ROAD WILL BECOME EVEN MORE OVERLOADED CHAOS ON OUR LOCAL ROADS

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6087</th>
<th>Respondent: 15583809 / Nigel Stephenson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)
   North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a major disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6095</th>
<th>Respondent: 15584001 / Lorna Thompson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6098  Respondent: 15584065 / Amy Gervasio  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. I have already pointed out that the main road through Send is insufficient for the amount of traffic planned in Send alone. If the interchange of the A3 goes ahead then the amount of traffic coming from the Wisley Airfield, Gosden Hill and Blackwell Farm planned developments along with the Send developments means that Clandon, Burnt Common and Send will be completely overloaded and the congestion will become unbearable!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6105  Respondent: 15584097 / George Gervasio  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to the four-way junction on the A3 proposed at Burnt Common. On the face of it, a four way junction at Burnt Common is something I would have approved of but not at the expense of this massive over development. The development across the north east of Guildford at Wisley Airfield, Send and Gosden Hill will mean high levels of traffic that small villages really shouldn’t expect to have to cope with. The main road through Clandon, Burnt Common and Send is unfit for purpose. There are places along them where heavy goods vehicles cannot pass each other and there is no prospect (or plan) to widen the roads as houses line both sides of them.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6112  Respondent: 15584161 / Alexandra Elson  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.
The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is an inappropriate way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).
This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3). The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6116  Respondent: 15584481 / Jeremy Hamilton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6124  Respondent: 15584641 / Miriam Gilkerson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7046  Respondent: 15584641 / Miriam Gilkerson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to site A43a - the on/off ramp at Burnt Common. Traffic is already significant, and this will significantly increase the jams through Send, Ripley and Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6139  Respondent: 15584833 / Maria Fort  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

.  I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition of north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6153  Respondent: 15585249 / Joe Eke  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- **I OBJECT** to Policy A43a (Land for North facing slip roads to/from A3 at send Marsh/Burnt Common) This would necessitate a 4-way junction at Burnt Common and would inevitably increase the amount of traffic using the local roads in Send. This junction would worsen the problem of drivers using Send as a cut through from Guildford to Woking on local roads that are just not intended for this purpose.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6152  **Respondent:** 15585281 / Val Woodland  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I support in principle the idea of a new junction with access to and from the A3 in both directions somewhere between Burpham and Burnt Common, however a better place for this is nearer to site A25 Gosden Hill Farm, using both sides of the Portsmouth Road dual carriageway to access the new junction from Burnt Common roundabout.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7097  **Respondent:** 15585313 / Kim Styles  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO – the On and Off ramp at Burnt Common/Clandon Site A43a – this will only increase existing traffic problems in the villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6170  **Respondent:** 15585345 / Wanita Styles  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO – A43a THE CLANDON ON OFF RAMP – THIS WILL NOT HELP TRAFFIC PROBLEMS THROUGH THE VILLAGES IT WILL INTENSIFY IT

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
16. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6189  Respondent: 15585601 / Sophie Corstin  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council’s eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of
this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)
The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6250  Respondent: 15587169 / Sylvia Denison  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A3 Interchange

I object to a new intersection as proposed. It would lead to an increase through Send and surrounding villages which the existing infrastructure is unable to withstand.

Send in particular would become a permanent through route for traffic avoiding the A3 Northbound during the morning peak hours. The reverse would apply in respect of the A3 southbound for the evening (5pm-7pm) traffic flow.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6257  Respondent: 15587233 / Jane Clark  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6366  Respondent: 15589665 / Anna Worsley  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The addition of north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6390  Respondent: 15590241 / Claire Tallis  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common(A43a)

North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6412  Respondent: 15590529 / Linda Mumford  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

New interchange on A3 at Burnt Common. It is obvious that this is being put in place to support the huge housing sites intended for Wisley Airfield, Garlick’s Arch and Gosden Farm. Building these sites will be easier to pass if Guildford can show they have this road infrastructure in place. It will destroy an area of countryside that supports a high diversity of wildlife and destroy the peace and quiet for current householders in the area. It will also cause more congestion on the A3 which struggles at peak times already.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6430  Respondent: 15590593 / Johnathan Page  Agent:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document:</th>
<th>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6515  Respondent: 15593729 / Martin Warwick  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)**

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6515  Respondent: 15593761 / Celestyn Kwapisiewicz  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)**

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Comment ID: PSLPS16/6561  
**Respondent:** 15594817 / Toni Thompson  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6524  
**Respondent:** 15594849 / Andrew Thomas  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6529  
**Respondent:** 15594945 / Sally Thomas  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/6538  Respondent: 15595105 / James Beauchamp  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. I have already described how Send Road is heavily congested especially at peak times. By creating a new interchange at Burnt Common this will choke Send Road and the Village with additional traffic to and from Woking. Not only will this become the new rat run into Woking from the A3 and the M25 but will also have to contend with additional traffic from the proposed 2000 houses at Wisley, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill and 1850 houses at Blackwell farm. This on a road that is already heavily congested.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6553  Respondent: 15595297 / Caroline Davison  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

And lastly a most strongly object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common being built. The roads from Send, Ripley and Clandon are frequently gridlocked during rush hours as it is now and a new interchange would without a doubt make traffic on these road a thousand times worse. Please do not allow this to go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6574  Respondent: 15595553 / Carol Davis  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The installation of ramps to use the northbound A3 would create a large amount of additional traffic to the local roads that are already overburdened, especially at rush hour times. The A247 through Send is already an extremely busy road and would become gridlocked with the additional traffic.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6575  Respondent: 15595585 / Tim Wiggins  Agent:
Adding more houses at Garlick's Arch will already add to the traffic congestion in the area, as will additional entry / exit ramps at Burnt Common - the A3 is already heavily delayed each rush hour at the M25 junction and through Guildford itself. Additional entry / exit ramps at Burnt Common will push traffic through Clandon and Send which are relatively small roads and are already busy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6593  Respondent: 15596129 / Kim Beauchamp  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. I have already described how Send Road is heavily congested especially at peak times. By creating a new interchange at Burnt Common this will choke Send Road and the Village with additional traffic to and from Woking. Not only will this become the new rat run into Woking from the A3 and the M25 but will also have to contend with additional traffic from the proposed 2000 houses at Wisley, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill and 1850 houses at Blackwell farm. This on a road that is already heavily congested.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
We strongly object to there being a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because of the impact on Send to the increased level of traffic from the proposed new housing at Wisley Airfield, Godden Hill, Burpham and Blackwell farm. The noise and pollution that would result from gridlocked traffic would be unacceptable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to site A43a the proposed on off ramp at burnt common as this will again only increase traffic in villages. Our villages are being changed and as our local council I would have expected you to want to preserve our rural way of life. Guildford itself is losing its attractiveness as an historical town and will shortly be unrecognisable if any of the proposed large developments go ahead.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6695  
**Respondent:** 15601121 / Elspeth Anderson  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)
The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of “through” traffic.
The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.
This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6715  
**Respondent:** 15601473 / Joseph Fort  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)
The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.
The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.
This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6726  
**Respondent:** 15601825 / Claire Billard  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6728</th>
<th>Respondent: 15601857 / Martin Billard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New north and southbound slip-roads to and from the A3 to the A 247 Clandon Road (policy A43a) This proposal will encourage additional traffic along the very narrow, winding A247 Clandon Road and the Send Barns Lane/Send Road leading to Woking, the traffic along both of which are already at capacity. Send village is a ribbon development of housing along both sides of Send Road, so there is no scope to widen it, and where it ends at the Old Woking roundabout none of the connecting roads can be widened to ease congestion because of the existing surrounding buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6737</th>
<th>Respondent: 15602113 / Janet Woodward</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This proposal will encourage additional traffic along the very narrow, winding A247 Clandon Road and the Send Barns Lane/Send Road leading to Woking, the traffic along both of which are already at capacity. Send village is a ribbon development of housing along both sides of Send Road, so there is no scope to widen it, and where it ends at the Old Woking roundabout none of the connecting roads can be widened to ease congestion because of the existing surrounding buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This ill-conceived plan to enable major development at Gosden Hill and Wisley completely fails to take account of the serpentine configuration of the Clandon Road and of the inability to improve the traffic flow along it and the Send Road because of the proximity of existing housing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6737</th>
<th>Respondent: 15602113 / Janet Woodward</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT TO site A43a the on and off ramp at Burnt Common/Clandon – this will increase traffic problems, not help them! There will be a catastrophic increase in traffic resulting from spreading new housing estates across the area. Infrastructure considered here as an afterthought, rather than pre-condition of development. Should be a key issue for the rest of the plan. • Excessive housebuilding in countryside not supported by any funding or provision for infrastructure. • Heavy focus on building on greenfield sites inefficient and unnecessary: cheap for developers but much more expensive for the public who have to fund the infrastructure. • Draft CIL scale discourages use of brownfield land first. • No plan for organic increase in existing traffic congestion, let alone once thousands of houses are built across the countryside. Local roads hardly considered. Green Belt being eroded before road widening/improvement plans certain, encouraging over-development of greenfield sites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment ID: PSLPS16/7249  Respondent: 15602529 / Darren Lambert  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because it would be disastrous for Send and the (A247) would be gridlocked all day.

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6758  Respondent: 15602561 / Jonathan Clark  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6759  Respondent: 15602561 / Jonathan Clark  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:

- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
- The site is liable to frequent flooding
- The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
- There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6766</th>
<th>Respondent: 15602817 / Paul Douek</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7415</th>
<th>Respondent: 15603297 / Rony Douek</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a). This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable and puts pressure on already over-crowded but narrow country lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7267</th>
<th>Respondent: 15603361 / Ann Watkins</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to A43a - the on and off ramp at Clandon – this will increase traffic problems in the villages, not help them, and increase the speed and density of the traffic through our villages and past local schools, as well as increase noise and pollution levels which are already at excessive levels.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6814</th>
<th>Respondent: 15606625 / Rebecca Sear-George</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? (-) is Sound? (-) is Legally Compliant? (-)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6813</th>
<th>Respondent: 15606657 / Kim Hopwood</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? (-) is Sound? (-) is Legally Compliant? (-)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6837</th>
<th>Respondent: 15607681 / Robin Hopwood</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? (-) is Sound? (-) is Legally Compliant? (-)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)**

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7652  Respondent: 15609185 / Sophocles Alexiou  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. I have already described how Send Road is heavily congested especially at peak times. By creating a new interchange at Burnt Common this will choke Send Road and the Village with additional traffic to and from Woking. Not only will this become the new rat run into Woking from the A3 and the M25 but will also have to contend with additional traffic from the proposed 2000 houses at Wisley, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill and 1850 houses at Blackwell farm. This on a road that is already heavily congested.

I urge you to reconsider before inflicting irreversible damage to our communities - because that is exactly what you will be doing.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6919  Respondent: 15610433 / Clare Porter  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6918</th>
<th>Respondent: 15610465 / Tess Corlett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)**

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6916</th>
<th>Respondent: 15610529 / Mark Ransome</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would have a disastrous impact on local communities. Without additional measures to improve traffic flow around the Burnt Common round-about the addition of the slip roads will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic that will turn an already busy round-about into traffic jam hot spot.

This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved due to housing developments around the round-about.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6939</th>
<th>Respondent: 15610785 / Liz Vinall</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition of north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved. THIS PROPOSAL APPEARS NOT TO HAVE BEEN PROPERLY THOUGHT THROUGH.
This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7446  Respondent: 15610913 / Gillian Hague  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition of north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved. THIS PROPOSAL APPEARS NOT TO HAVE BEEN PROPERLY THOUGHT THROUGH.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6946  Respondent: 15611105 / Ramsey Shubbar  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6945  Respondent: 15611137 / Scott Hutchinson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comment ID:</strong> PSLPS16/6944  <strong>Respondent:</strong> 15611201 / Jed Alexander  <strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comment ID:</strong> PSLPS16/6977  <strong>Respondent:</strong> 15614113 / Sally Couzens  <strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We would like this email to be taken as our objection to the Final Draft Local Plan, specifically the proposed development at Garlick's Arch, the 4-way interchange for the A3 at Burnt Common and taking Send out of the green belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already, simply commuting from our residence in Sendmarsh to our places of work in Guildford and Cobham respectively on a daily basis, now proves to be unnecessarily prolonged and problematic. This is due to the blatantly obvious already excessive traffic encountered on roads such as the Sendmarsh Road or the larger Portsmouth Road. This clearly indicates that the road infrastructure is oversubscribed as a result of an already overpopulated area. Simply increasing the number of existing houses with proposed developments of an extra 400 houses along with increased industrial warehousing, will be disastrous for the villages of Send and Ripley. This would bring the certainty of gridlocked roads to this area. Currently we both have to leave for work over an hour earlier than we previously did five to ten years ago due to the increased traffic volume and resulting poor traffic flow that currently exists in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford Borough Council are already not investing enough money into the maintenance of the roads, leaving them in a terrible state. We are very concerned that increased traffic using these roads will mean they fall even further into disrepair. The local schools and doctors surgery are already oversubscribed - what will happen when there are so many more people trying to use these services?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We are also concerned about loosing the woodland around this area, which is what attracts many people to live and pay the high housing costs including the high rate of council tax in the first instance. Simply removing these villages from the green belt is detrimental to the standard of living in this area and is clearly only being proposed in order to open the flood gates for future land development that would only offer financial benefit for non-residents and the local authority.

We feel this level of development would change the area we live in unrecognisably and therefore would not be an area we would necessarily want to live in in the future.

We should be grateful if these objections and comments would be put before Inspector on this matter.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6981</th>
<th>Respondent: 15614721 / Charles Leonard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strongly object to the creation of new north and south bound slip roads to and from the A3 to the A247 Clandon Road and Burnt Common (Policy No: A43A) - it is already impossible to drive into Guildford on any given afternoon from 16.00hrs onwards due to &quot;sheer weight of traffic&quot;. The A3 to and from Guildford is already hugely over-used and any further increase in traffic would cause severe safety issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6982</th>
<th>Respondent: 15614753 / Anthony McCulloch</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strongly object to the creation of new north and south bound slip roads to and from the A3 to the A247 Clandon Road and Burnt Common (Policy No: A43A) - it is already impossible to drive into Guildford on any given afternoon from 16.00hrs onwards due to &quot;sheer weight of traffic&quot;. The A3 to and from Guildford is already hugely over-used and any further increase in traffic would cause severe safety issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6983</th>
<th>Respondent: 15614785 / Richard Palmer</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I strongly object to the creation of new north and south bound slip roads to and from the A3 to the A247 Clandon Road and Burnt Common (Policy No: A43A) - it is already impossible to drive into Guildford on any given afternoon from 16.00hrs onwards due to "sheer weight of traffic". The A3 to and from Guildford is already hugely over-used and any further increase in traffic would cause severe safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7621</th>
<th>Respondent: 15614817 / Jan Pearson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I strongly object to the creation of new north and south bound slip roads to and from the A3 to the A247 Clandon Road and Burnt Common (Policy No: A43A) - it is already impossible to drive into Guildford on any given afternoon from 16.00hrs onwards due to "sheer weight of traffic". The A3 to and from Guildford is already hugely over-used and any further increase in traffic would cause severe safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6985</th>
<th>Respondent: 15615233 / Gareth Nassh</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I strongly object to the creation of new north and south bound slip roads to and from the A3 to the A247 Clandon Road and Burnt Common (Policy No: A43A) - it is already impossible to drive into Guildford on any given afternoon from 16.00hrs onwards due to "sheer weight of traffic". The A3 to and from Guildford is already hugely over-used and any further increase in traffic would cause severe safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6986</th>
<th>Respondent: 15615265 / Clive Pott</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I strongly object to the creation of new north and south bound slip roads to and from the A3 to the A247 Clandon Road and Burnt Common (Policy No: A43A) - it is already impossible to drive into Guildford on any given afternoon from 16.00hrs onwards due to "sheer weight of traffic". The A3 to and from Guildford is already hugely over-used and any further increase in traffic would cause severe safety issues.
I strongly object to the creation of new north and south bound slip roads to and from the A3 to the A247 Clandon Road and Burnt Common (Policy No: A43A) - it is already impossible to drive into Guildford on any given afternoon from 16.00hrs onwards due to "sheer weight of traffic". The A3 to and from Guildford is already hugely over-used and any further increase in traffic would cause severe safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

** I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/7030</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15617185 / Michelle Mitchell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/7043</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15618689 / Julia Ray</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not want these new ramps as there will be a flood of traffic through the villages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>build on. This ancient woodland provides a habitat for thousands of birds and animals and trees and destroying it would be criminal to my mind. This site is entirely inappropriate for development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not least because of its propensity to flood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/7104</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15627329 / Loraine Crates</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to site A43a, the on and off ramp at Burnt Common. This will increase through traffic in all surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon not reduce them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/7111</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15627393 / Brandon White</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because it would be disastrous for Send and the (A247) would be at a standstill all day.

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7135  Respondent: 15629025 / Surrey County Council (Sir or madam)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43a

Land for new north facing slip roads to/from A3 at Send March/Burnt Common Page 224

The site edging should probably be extended to provide the necessary land, including highway land, required for roundabouts on either side of the A3.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7155  Respondent: 15629377 / The Woodland Trust (Jack Taylor)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference number</th>
<th>Name of site</th>
<th>Nearest town</th>
<th>Development description</th>
<th>Woodland adjacent or within?</th>
<th>Type of woodland affected (e.g. ASNW, PAWS, secondary) &amp; grid reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A43a</td>
<td>Land for new North facing slip roads to/from A3 at Send Marsh/Burnt Common</td>
<td>Send</td>
<td>“These sites are allocated for a new northbound on-slip to the A3 trunk road from A247 Clandon Road and a new southbound off-slip from the A3 trunk road to A247 Clandon Road.”</td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>Oldland’s Copse, TQ045548</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7165</th>
<th>Respondent: 15631105 / Pamela Jacqueline Hagan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to new on/off ramps for the A3 planned at Burnt Common (A43). The local roads through Send, Clandon and Old Woking already struggle to cope with the volume of traffic in the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7254</th>
<th>Respondent: 15633217 / Emma Cooper</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposed A43a on/off ramp at Burnt Common as again this will only increase the quantity of traffic in the area, which is already struggling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7235</th>
<th>Respondent: 15634145 / Annette Davies</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposed interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because Send would be need to take the traffic from the proposed Wisley Airfield site and from Gosdon Hill thus causing horrendous traffic jams and nobody getting anywhere quickly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7238</th>
<th>Respondent: 15634177 / John Davies</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposed interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because Send would be need to take the traffic from the proposed Wisley Airfield site and from Gosdon Hill thus causing horrendous traffic jams and nobody getting anywhere quickly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7263  **Respondent:** 15637633 / Scott Kent  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because it would be disastrous for Send and the A247 would be gridlocked all day.

6. I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/ M25.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7301  **Respondent:** 15639905 / Alison Azzopardi  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- The concept of a further suggestion of placing a 4 way interchange (Northbound and Southbound on slip) to the A3 will create absolute traffic chaos – ultimately creating a direct route, and thus increased traffic from Woking to the A3. I object to this unworkable and ill-conceived alteration to the road network infrastructure.
- During rush hour this route will take vehicles through mainly residential areas, and past the front of two nurseries, a medical centre and a first school. It will simply gridlock Send and Burncommon along the A247 main artery.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7324  **Respondent:** 15640705 / M J Azzopardi  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to any and all erosion of the green belt, there is precious little left in this area of the county. In setting local villages will destroy the area (Policy P2).
- The area surrounding Burntcommon is now subject to a disproportionate level of suggested housing and development (Policy yA43).
- This was not included in the Regulation 18 Draft and therefore has not been consulted on previously, it seems a cynical method of circumventing the correct process. I object.
• The concept of a further suggestion of placing a 4 way interchange (Northbound and Southbound on slip) to the A3 will create absolute traffic chaos – ultimately creating a direct route, and thus increased traffic from Woking to the A3. I object to this unworkable and ill-conceived alteration to the road network infrastructure.
• During rush hour this route will take vehicles through mainly residential areas, and past the front of two nurseries, a medical centre and a first school. It will simply gridlock Send and Burncommon along the A247 main artery.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7336  Respondent: 15641281 / Paula Redmond  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)
The addition of north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.
The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford and the A25 would have to go through Clandon and Burnt Common. This has the potential to cause damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7348  Respondent: 15641505 / Annabella Goldsmith  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The ramp at Burnt Common/Clandon will only increase the traffic problems in Ripley Village and the whole area. Just imagine how it would be given that Ripley Village is one street, and the traffic already traverses the Village mostly at speeds in excess of 40 mph.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7350  Respondent: 15641569 / Trevalyn Gregory  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

5. I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because it would be disastrous for Send and the (A247) would be gridlocked all day.
6. I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7371  Respondent: 15644577 / John Cotton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO the late inclusion of site A43 Garlicks Arch, and to site A43a the on and off ramp at Burnt Common, this will increase traffic problems in the villages, not help them!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7533  Respondent: 15651009 / Miranda Pigram  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25 from and to the Woking area, there would also be additional traffic through Clandon. This would make the interchange a disaster for Send and Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7535  Respondent: 15652033 / James Scrace  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the A3 on off ramp at Clandon - this will create more congestion and traffic incidents, not solve them.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7541  Respondent: 15652833 / Don Babington  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ). is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7570  Respondent: 15653505 / Dave Robins  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ). is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO site A43A the on and off ramp at Clandon/Burnt Common. This will cause complete chaos in the area, as all roads leading to the junction are country roads leading from Clandon, Ripley and Send. At present it only takes an incident at Wisley /Junction 10 of the M25 and our villages are swamped with traffic. This junction will make the whole situation worse as the local roads are so narrow and are unable to be widened to suit increased traffic flow. The Send Road only leads to similar narrow roads in Old Woking and Hoebridge areas, which are also unable to be widened.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7607  Respondent: 15657057 / Frances Turner  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ). is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY A43a BURNT COMMON

---

Section page number 342  Document page number 343
I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a). The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

I object to the proposed Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C). The Infrastructure Schedule sets out the key infrastructure requirements on which the delivery of the plan depends. For each of the Key Allocated Sites in the borough it identifies infrastructure projects that are required, except for Garlick’s Arch (A43) which is not mentioned. It is clear that the Plan takes no account of the infrastructure required for this site and is therefore not fit for purpose.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7610  Respondent: 15657121 / Robert Wheeler  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site A43a the on and off ramp at Burnt Common/Clandon as this will increase traffic problems in the villages, NOT help them!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7646  Respondent: 15658497 / Philip Williams  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to policy A43.30 the development of new four way interchange onto the A3 which would mean that narrow Send Road (A247) would be the main route for traffic leaving the M25 and A3. It is already crowded and vulnerable to traffic jams. Further traffic from this development would result in permanent gridlock. It simply would not work. Send would have to take traffic from the proposed 2000 new houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm. Much of this traffic to and from the A3, M25, Woking and Guildford would go through Send. Send Road, which is already overloaded, would become gridlocked. Noise and pollution levels, already at excessive levels, would worsen. This must be avoided.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7710  Respondent: 15665697 / Elizabeth Cross  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to policy A43.30 the development of new four way interchange onto the A3 which would mean that narrow Send Road (A247) would be the main route for traffic leaving the M25 and A3. It is already crowded and vulnerable to traffic jams. Further traffic from this development would result in permanent gridlock. It simply would not work. Send would have to take traffic from the proposed 2000 new houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm. Much of this traffic to and from the A3, M25, Woking and Guildford would go through Send. Send Road, which is already overloaded, would become gridlocked. Noise and pollution levels, already at excessive levels, would worsen. This must be avoided.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7733  Respondent: 15666625 / Anna Ruddy  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of 'through' traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7735  Respondent: 15667489 / Tibbalds (Jon Herbert)  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site A43a is to be occupied by infrastructure allocations SRN9 and SRN10. Section four of this report details why the new slip roads are unjustified and should be considered to be unsound. On this basis allocation A43a which is specifically allocated to build the slip roads should be removed for the same reasons.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7847  Respondent: 15674689 / Chris Baker  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a). All traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7923  Respondent: 15687201 / Mandy Cox  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities, which do need to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of `through` traffic. E.g. all traffic from London/M25 to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8000  Respondent: 15697921 / Chris Smedmore  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site A43a, the on-off ramp at Burnt Common. This is likely to have a further negative impact on traffic through the villages of Send, Ripley and Clandon, drawing in huge amounts of traffic to narrow village roads which are already liable to congestion and cannot feasibly be improved to support the additional through-flow. Traffic should be directed away from narrow village roads close to schools with young children, not towards them.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8002  Respondent: 15698017 / Katie Taylor  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)
The addition of north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common will draw in a huge amount of traffic through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking in areas where the focus should be to reduce, not increase traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8008  Respondent: 15698753 / Anna Calvert  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site A43a and the on/off ramp at Clandon. This will inevitably increase traffic problems in the local villages and particularly Send which is already overloaded. Noise and pollution levels would worsen. This must be avoided.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8014  Respondent: 15700353 / Edward Warren  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the plan to install a motorway style on/off junction on the A3 at Burntcommon because no explanation given to the how the narrow A247 can carry the loads. The expansion of this road into one capable of handling the traffic would be a difficult challenge without causing notable destruction.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8016  Respondent: 15700353 / Edward Warren  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the on/off junction at Burntcommon since Send (and Clandon) will become alternative cut throughs when the M25 is blocked (and that happens frequently).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8041  Respondent: 15704865 / Lauren Hunt  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because it would be disastrous for Send and the (A247) would be at a standstill all day.

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a rat run to the A3/M25.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8048  Respondent: 15705281 / Anna-Maria Mitchell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the 4 on/off ramp at Burnt Common to the A3. This would cause a huge increase in the volume of traffic through our villages of Clandon and Ripley. The A247 is extremely narrow in places so it would be inappropriate to increase the flow of traffic down this road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8054  Respondent: 15705729 / Martyn Heard  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. The added traffic passing through Ripley, Send and Clandon would be enormously detrimental, It would not be sustainable as access through these villages cannot be improved

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8077  Respondent: 15710433 / Simon Hester  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I am appalled by the suggestion of the North/South slip road on to A3 as will massivly worsen the traffic situation in let us not forget a small rural village, especially as there is a far superior site at Potters Lane/ Ewebanks area away from the settled community.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7759  **Respondent:** 15746081 / Highways England (Patrick Blake)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

[Highways England made a formal representation on 18 July 2016. See the first attachment for this representation including comments on this element of the consultation documents and/or associated evidence base.

Highways England made further comments on 5 October 2016 following a clarification meeting with Guildford Borough Council. See the second attachment for this letter.]

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  

1. Highways England letter 18 July 2016 - Representation to consultation.pdf (7.7 MB)  
2. Highways England letter 5 October 2016 - Further comments following clarification meeting with GBC.pdf (1.2 MB)

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4556  **Respondent:** 15922337 / Andrew Malcher  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43a, the proposed on/off ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common as this will inevitably cause traffic chaos on the local road network throughout Ripley, Burnt Common, Send and West Clandon, with absolutely no possibility of mitigation due to the nature of our rural roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3395  **Respondent:** 17424705 / Keith Brothwell  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43a

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common in its currently proposed form. There is no mention of improvements to local road infrastructure as a dependency on this proposal. Local roads through Send and Ripley are already heavily congested with pipeline plans leading to further volumes. Traffic already queues at peak periods as existing roads can scarcely cope with the current levels of traffic. Please see below for more information relating to my object on this issue.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A44 - Land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill, Send
### Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/541</th>
<th>Respondent: 8553761 / A Howlett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2914</th>
<th>Respondent: 8559745 / Mr Brian East</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill there is insufficient access and it would spoil a high amenity area in beautiful countryside.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2308</th>
<th>Respondent: 8561057 / Chris Brown</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy A44:Land west of Send Hill (page 225)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the inclusion of two travellers pitches on this site which would be in contravention of your own stated policy of having a ratio of two such pitches for every 500 houses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is possible that the widening of the Send Hill road would encroach on the area of the site thus reducing its capacity for 40 houses assuming it could even accommodate as many as that which is doubtful. Two pitches among so few houses would certainly have a negative effect on the value of any houses built there and would certainly not secure the best return on the tax payers investment on the land.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send Hill is certainly not a suitable location for travellers anyway access being difficult from the traffic lights especially with cars parked on one side opposite the school and on the brow of the hill making the approach quite hazardous.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition, there is a school at the bottom of Send Hill and at peak school times it is very congested with parents dropping their children. By travellers driving their vehicles with caravans making a long vehicle with potential blind spots then this will only heighten the risk of safety for parents and children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, a much smaller development without traveller pitches and in keeping with the surrounding properties could be a possibility. This would be a natural extension of the housing building line up Send Hill and could provide a development in-keeping with the rest of the area.

Traveller issues have arisen in Send several times over the years and Send residents and our Parish Council have expressed their views many times to you the Guildford Borough Council and GBC do not seem to heed our views and now again insist on trying to locate two pitches in a most unsuitable location. These pitches appear to have been randomly dropped into this area as they were originally in the centre of the village in Wharf Lane, which was another equally ill conceived area to site them.

[Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it] and they should be housed in areas where I understand they prefer which are typically more rural and away from the housing developments.

The Local Plan is lacking evidence and detail

I feel there is a big disconnect between the requirements most residents feel they need and the locations they would sight developments against the methods employed by GBC and the seemingly alarming developments proposed.

The plan is considerably lacking in details which does nothing to help the residents who ultimately will determine the plan as a collective. For example

1. There is no explanation of why so much housing capacity is required in this area and who it is for.
2. There are no artist’s impressions of how a development might look or any idea given of what an “affordable house” looks like
3. What is a traveller’s pitch?
4. Are there any conditions attached to the allocation of travellers pitches?
5. How are they to be managed? How are services arranged and paid for?
6. What term do the travellers stay for? Is there a minimum or maximum?

I feel if these questions could be answered then I would be better informed and could make a better decision.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/2316</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8561057 / Chris Brown</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Specific Comments about Policy A44: Land west of Send Hill (page 225)

I know this area well and I grew up nearby. Whilst I recognise there may be some people who wish to object to this site I would like to put forward a more positive view point in respect to possible development, although I offer some reservations as well.

1. The plan suggests the total site may be able to support approximately 40 houses but looking at the area and allowing for access roads to be built within the site, I feel this is a little optimistic. A figure of between 15 to 20 homes could be more realistic.

1. The development of the site should not aim to be high density or high rise. It should be in keeping with the rest of Send Hill and Winds Ridge which would mean either chalet bungalows and smaller houses, with maybe one or two large 4 or 5 bedroom houses added on slightly larger plots to enhance the overall appearance of the site.

1. The proposal to incorporate two traveller pitches as part of a mixed development would seem to be questionable. This site is the ONLY proposed mixed site in the whole of the Draft Local Plan for the Borough and in this regard would seem to be out of context in terms of mixed use compared to the other proposed sites.
If GBC were to develop the site as a mixed site then this would seem to contradict their main directive which is to ensure the best return on assets owned by the tax payer. This is because a close proximity mixed site would potentially mean a lower overall return on the final selling prices achieved for such a development. If this were the case, and was reflected by the mood of potential buyers, and borne out by final house sale prices, then this would be potentially a loss to the tax payer of several hundred thousand pounds. This could be interpreted as ill-conceived and irresponsible of GBC if this were to be reviewed at a future date and questions could be sought.

Considering the site overall, it would seem a better solution overall to not make this a mixed site and transfer the traveller sites to a more suitable location and one where it is concentrated on a traveller site only on one of the other proposed sites.

1. **I object** to the inclusion of two travellers pitches on this site which would be in contravention of your own stated policy of having a ratio of two such pitches for every 500 houses.

2. Traveller issues have arisen in Send several times over the years and Send residents and our Parish Council have expressed their views many times to you the Guildford Borough Council and I find it very disappointing that you do not seem to heed our views and now again insist on trying to locate two pitches in a most unsuitable location. [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it]

3. If the development was on a smaller scale then the impact on Send Hill would be considerably reduced. Send Hill and the roads off it are very quiet and this is the main appeal of the area. The addition of 15 to 20 more homes would not represent a large increase in road traffic or impact the existing residents.

4. It is true that that Send Hill is a single track country road but with sensible planning and a **low density** development I do not see this as causing any problems to the existing residents or making a dramatic impact. By contrast, if it were to be a high density development then I think the opposite would be true.

5. The land is in greenbelt and I am a big supporter of keeping the greenbelt and not allowing wide scale development. However, this site when viewed on the map could be considered as an extension of the existing housing line of Send Hill. The site is surrounded by mature oak trees which should remain and is bound on two sides by a footpath which should also remain. This means that the surrounding open fields are all kept intact and the views are unaltered, so residents, dog walkers and members of the public can continue to enjoy the amenity.

6. The sensible development of this site, being at the top of the hill and the highest point, means it would not be subject to flooding and would not be detrimental to the community and increased flood risk.

7. I understand that the land has been infilled over time and it has laid fallow for over 30 years. At one end of the field, the land owned by Guildford Borough Council, which is the main area of infill, there are methane vents. Further environmental tests may need to be reviewed to determine the exact position of any possible continued contamination.

8. By contrast, the far end of the field, closest to the cemetery, and not owned by GBC, this land has not been infilled as I understand it and recent environmental reports (dated as recently as 2015) seem to suggest that there is no contamination on this land. If this is the case, then perhaps this area could be considered for responsible, small scale development, to be in keeping with the current housing line.

I would like to place on record my objections which I would like to be seen by the Inspector.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2481  Respondent: 8561057 / Chris Brown  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A44:Land west of Send Hill (page 225)

I object to the inclusion of two travellers pitches on this site which would be in contravention of your own stated policy of having a ratio of two such pitches for every 500 houses.
It is possible that the widening of the Send Hill road would encroach on the area of the site thus reducing its capacity for 40 houses assuming it could even accommodate as many as that which is doubtful. Two pitches among so few houses would certainly have a negative effect on the value of any houses built there and would certainly not secure the best return on the tax payers investment on the land.

Send Hill is certainly not a suitable location for travellers anyway access being difficult from the traffic lights especially with cars parked on one side opposite the school and on the brow of the hill making the approach quite hazardous.

In addition, there is a school at the bottom of Send Hill and at peak school times it is very congested with parents dropping their children. By travellers driving their vehicles with caravans making a long vehicle with potential blind spots then this will only heighten the risk of safety for parents and children.

However, a much smaller development without traveller pitches and in keeping with the surrounding properties could be a possibility. This would be a natural extension of the housing building line up Send Hill and could provide a development in-keeping with the rest of the area.

Traveller issues have arisen in Send several times over the years and Send residents and our Parish Council have expressed their views many times to you the Guildford Borough Council and GBC do not seem to heed our views and now again insist on trying to locate two pitches in a most unsuitable location. These pitches appear to have been randomly dropped into this area as they were originally in the centre of the village in Wharf Lane, which was another equally ill conceived area to site them.

The Local Plan is lacking evidence and detail

I feel there is a big disconnect between the requirements most residents feel they need and the locations they would sight developments against the methods employed by GBC and the seemingly alarming developments proposed.

The plan is considerably lacking in details which does nothing to help the residents who ultimately will determine the plan as a collective. For example

1. There is no explanation of why so much housing capacity is required in this area and who it is
2. There are no artist's impressions of how a development might look or any idea given of what an "affordable house" looks like
3. What is a traveller's pitch?
4. Are there any conditions attached to the allocation of travellers pitches?
5. How are they to be managed? How are services arranged and paid for?
6. What term do the travellers stay for? Is there a minimum or maximum?

I feel if these questions could be answered then I would be better informed and could make a better decision.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3106  Respondent: 8561057 / Chris Brown  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Having carefully examined the above Proposed Plan I would like to place on record my objections which I would like to be seen by the Inspector.

I know this area well and I grew up nearby. Whilst I recognise there may be some people who wish to object to this site I would like to put forward a more positive view point in respect to possible development, although I offer some reservations as well.
1. The plan suggests the total site may be able to support approximately 40 houses but looking at the area and allowing for access roads to be built within the site, I feel this is a little optimistic. A figure of between 15 to 20 homes could be more realistic.

2. The development of the site should not aim to be high density or high ris. It should be in keeping with the rest of Send Hill and Winds Ridge which would mean either chalet bungalows and smaller houses, with maybe one or two large 4 or 5 bedroom houses added on slightly larger plots to enhance the overall appearance of the site.

3. The proposal to incorporate two traveler pitches as part of a mixed development would seem to be questionable. This site is the ONLY proposed mixed site in the whole of the Draft Local Plan for the Borough and in this regard would seem to be out of context in terms of mixed use compared to the other proposed sites.

If GBC were to develop the site as a mixed site then this would seem to contradict their main directive which is to ensure the best return on assets owned by the tax payer. This is because a close proximity mixed site would potentially mean a lower overall return on the final selling prices achieved for such a development. If this were the case, and was reflected by the mood of potential buyers, and borne out by final house sale prices, then this would be potentially a loss to the tax payer of several hundred thousand pounds. This could be interpreted as ill-conceived and irresponsible of GBC if this were to be reviewed at a future date and questions could be sought.

Considering the site overall, it would seem a better solution overall to not make this a mixed site and transfer the traveler sites to a more suitable location and one where it is concentrated on a traveler site only on one of the other proposed sites.

1. I object to the inclusion of two travelers pitches on this site which would be in contravention of your own stated policy of having a ratio of two such pitches for every 500 houses.

2. Traveler issues have arisen in Send several times over the years and Send residents and our Parish Council have expressed their views many times to you the Guildford Borough Council and I find it very disappointing that you do not seem to heed our views and you again insist on trying to locate two pitches in a most unsuitable location. [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it]

3. If the development were on a smaller scale then the impact on Send Hill would be considerably reduced. Send Hill and the roads off it are very quiet and this is the main appeal of the site. The addition of 15 to 20 more homes would not represent a large increase in road traffic or impact the existing residents.

4. It is true that Send Hill is a single track country road but with sensible planning and a low density development I do not see this as causing any problems to the existing residents or making a dramatic change. By contrast, if it were to be a high density development then I think the opposite would be true.

5. The land is in greenbelt and I am a big supporter of keeping the greenbelt and not allowing wide scale development. However, this site when viewed on the map could be considered as an extension of the existing housing line of Send Hill. The site is surrounded by mature oak trees which should remain and is bound on two sides by a footpath which should also remain. This means that the surrounding open fields are all kept intact and the views are unaltered, so residents, dog walkers and members of the public can continue to enjoy the amenity.

6. The sensible development of this site, being at the top of the hill and the highest point, means it would not be subject to flooding and would not be detrimental to the community and increased flood risk.

7. I understand that the land has been infilled over time and it has laid fallow for over 30 years. At one end of the field, the land owned by Guildford Borough Council, which is the main area of infill, there are methane vents. Further environmental tests may need to be reviewed to determine the exact position of any possible continued contamination.

8. By contrast, the far end of the field, closest to the cemetery, and not owned by GBC, this land has not been infilled as I understand it and recent environmental reports (dated as recently as 2015) seem to suggest that there is no contamination on this land. If this is the case, then perhaps this area could be considered for responsible, small scale development, to be in keeping with the current housing line.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT TO THE PLANS OUTLINED IN POLICY A44 on the grounds that this area borders a country lane, one track in places, in a beautiful, rural position. There is a beautiful cemetery adjacent, a place for peaceful reflection and quietude. The ethos of this area will be destroyed by the addition of 2 traveller sites and a further 40 homes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A 44. Land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill

The land in question is in the Green Belt and outside the current settlement boundary. This land was previously used as a gravel pit and then infilled and it is still monitored judging by the various manhole covers on the land.

The exit from this land onto Send Hill is very narrow and not suitable for the access for a small estate. This might also be described as backland development. The distant views from Potters Lane which are beautiful would be totally altered. Some of this land is farmed and, or grazed.

The site is unsuitable for a traveller site as it is away from the Village centre and approximately one mile from the shops and the nearest bus stops. The road Send Hill at the entrance to this site is 2.3 metres wide, very narrow and additionally unsuitable for long vehicles and on the opposite side of this narrow road is the multi-denominational Send Cemetery. It is a quiet area and an additional 40 houses and two traveller pitches would be detrimental to the surroundings.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1799  Respondent: 8566049 / Mr David W Lazenby  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the housing and travellers' sites proposed for Winds Ridge / Send Hill area. This would be a prominent intrusion in the existing pleasant landscape. It would generate more traffic to the Send Hill / Send Road junction, which would prove to be unmanageable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/124  Respondent: 8568673 / Enid Morgan  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( No ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

This is green belt land and suggest you concentrate on re-using brown field sites in the area, such as the whole of the Wisley airfield site. The road of Send Hill is far too narrow and is congested to the point of being impassable during school morning and afternoon traffic periods to the point of already being a "no go" area to the existing residents during those times. Why does the Council persist in these lines of thought when obvious brown field sites should be used more readily and legally, without the need for pointless consultation when brown field sites are available to such an extent as they are in this area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/423  Respondent: 8569729 / Eric Payne  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( No ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

This is green belt land and suggest you concentrate on re-using brown field sites in the area, such as the whole of the Wisley airfield site. The road of Send Hill is far too narrow and is congested to the point of being impassable during school morning and afternoon traffic periods to the point of already being a "no go" area to the existing residents during those times. Why does the Council persist in these lines of thought when obvious brown field sites should be used more readily and legally, without the need for pointless consultation when brown field sites are available to such an extent as they are in this area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Policy A44.1.9 Land to the west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill.

This site was not included in the draft and has not been consulted on previously. I object as this is part of the green belt and part of open countryside. In past years substantial land fill has taken place and it is still vented. Access is by narrow lanes which cannot cope with extra traffic generated. I believe part of this site or adjacent land is already owned by a Traveller family, which if site were developed far more than 2 traveller pitches would appear. 40 Homes, if needed, would be better provided on the burnt common site which seems to have disappeared from the latest version of the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2760  Respondent: 8571137 / G Mansbridge  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to your plan for the building of 40 houses and 2 traveller's pitches at Send Hill because of the very narrow road and the site contamination with very unsafe landfill.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7583  Respondent: 8571137 / G Mansbridge  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to your plan for the building of 40 houses and 2 traveller's pitches at Send Hill because of the very narrow road and the site contamination with very unsafe landfill.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3724  Respondent: 8574369 / Douglas French  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches on Send Hill because the location is unsuitable. The subsoil of the proposed site contains unsafe landfill waste dating back to the 1960s when it was shown on Ordnance Survey maps as “refuse and slag heap”. The date of the landfill pre-dates the EU Landfill Regulations in 1999 but it was registered at GBC from 2005 onwards. Any disturbance could be a health hazard due to unknown substances which are also described as “unrestricted”. It would be dangerous to local residents for this hazardous waste to be disturbed. The site should, therefore, never have been brought forward for consideration. It would definitely not be sufficient to “condition” it as GBC is prone to doing.
I OBJECT to the proposed development at Send Hill since it does not appear to be in accordance with The Government’s 2015 guidelines on traveller sites. GBC’s Traveller Accommodation Assessment of 2012 is acknowledged in their 2016 Sustainability Appraisal as being out of date which has resulted in an over allocation of traveller sites. GBC needed to re-examine its evidence base before coming forward with this proposal in the Local Plan. It seriously failed in its duty of care by not doing so.

I OBJECT to the proposed development at Send Hill because it is on a narrow country road with inadequate on road parking, it is in the Green Belt, near a nature reserve and an amenity area of beautiful countryside. It is an unsuitable location which has been introduced into the Local Plan at the last minute without first doing proper research on the history and characteristics of the site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6585</th>
<th>Respondent: 8574689 / Mr David Hemmings</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td>A44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I wish to object on a number of grounds to the propose development identified above, as the access will be via a narrow country road which despite being unsuitable is also part of a high amenity area set in beautiful countryside which would be ruined by such a development. It is also my understanding that the area is documented as unsafe landfill. Moreover, the proposed number of houses potentially could result in many extra cars in Send Hill which is already suffering from congestion, particularly at school run time. This proposal, taken together with the many other proposals, eg Clockbarn Nursery, Burnt Common, Garlick Arch are swamping the character and identity of the village and placing far too high demands on infrastructure, schools and amenities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/420</th>
<th>Respondent: 8579393 / Mr John Sweeting</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td>A44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would like to object to the inclusion of this site in the draft local plan for the following reasons:

1. The number of houses needed in the Borough was changed between the first and second issues of the draft plan indicating that there is considerable uncertainty in this figure and the basis and method of calculation. In view of the recent EU referendum vote and its impact on future immigration, the number of houses required is likely to reduce further.
   With smaller house numbers the need for any loss of the Greenbelt should be reassessed as 'special circumstances' necessary for reclassification have not been established.
2. This sites was introduced at the last minute and there has been insufficient time for consultation before its inclusion in the draft plan.
3. This development will add to the disproportionate burden on the north east of the Borough.
4. There is a question as to the suitability of the land for building purposes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Re: Site numbered A44 in the revised draft local plan.

I would like to object to the inclusion of this site in the draft local plan for the following reasons:

1. The number of houses needed in the Borough was changed between the first and second issues of the draft plan indicating that there is considerable uncertainty in this figure and the basis and method of calculation. In view of the recent EU referendum vote and its impact on future immigration, the number of houses required is likely to reduce further. With smaller house numbers the need for any loss of the Greenbelt should be reassessed as ‘special circumstances’ necessary for reclassification have not been established.
2. This site was introduced at the last minute and there has been insufficient time for consultation before its inclusion in the draft plan.
3. This development will add to the disproportionate burden on the north east of the Borough.
4. There is a question as to the suitability of the land for building purposes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2982  
Respondent: 8586017 / Leslie Brown  
Agent: 

Policy A44: Land west of Send Hill (page 225)

I have already written to you with my objection to the two traveller pitches proposed for the above location and now enclose a recent press report concerning travellers’ visits to sites in the Guildford area. This is only one of many such reports of similar events in Ripley and elsewhere in the country but this is ample evidence of the reason why people react to any mention of travellers and the prospect of their being located in any residential area.

Please bring this to the notice of the Inspector.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3191  
Respondent: 8586017 / Leslie Brown  
Agent: 

I object to the inclusion of two travellers pitches on this site which would be in contravention of your own stated policy of having a ratio of two such pitches for every 500 houses. It is possible that the widening of the Send Hill road would encroach on the area of the site thus reducing its capacity for 40 houses assuming it could even accommodate as many as that which is doubtful. In any event two pitches among so few houses would certainly have a negative effect on the value of any houses built there and would certainly not secure the best return on the tax payers investment in the land.
Send Hill is certainly not a suitable location for travellers anyway access being difficult from the traffic lights especially with cars parked on one side opposite the school and on the brow of the hill making the approach quite hazardous. What evidence is there that travellers are keen to be located among houses to enable them to integrate with the community.

On the other hand a small development without traveller pitches and In keeping with the surrounding properties could be a possibility.

Traveller issues have arisen in Send several times over the years and Send residents and our Parish Council have expressed their views many times to you the Guildford Borough Council and find it very disappointing that you do not seem to heed our views and now again insist on trying to locate two pitches in a most unsuitable location. [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it]

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2377  Respondent: 8586817 / Mr J Lawes  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT

To the proposed 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill ,my family and l live in [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998], one of the access roads to The Send Hill site , our lane is very narrow and cannot sustain any further major traffic. The countryside will be ruined! House values will fall!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8224  Respondent: 8589953 / Michael R. Murphy  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 Travellers Pitches at Send Hill. 

A totally inappropriate location with very narrow Roads with single tack roads with insufficient access.

The subsoil here contains documented unsafe landfill waste registered at GBC.

This development would spoil a high amenity area set in beautiful countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6581  Respondent: 8591169 / Michael Bruton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the proposed 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill ,my family and l live in [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it]
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY A44

1. I object to the inclusion of Send Hill (A44). This is a high quality Green Belt area which would be spoiled by development. It is also the site of an old refuse tip who’s contents are unknown and must therefore present a potential health hazard.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7197   Respondent: 8591521 / Mark Daniell   Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A44. Send Hill is an extremely narrow road and access onto Potter's Lane is difficult. Putting more cars on this road would cause extra problems and the risk of accident. I also understand that the land is previous landfill and is unsuitable for residential use. Again I am concerned that our schools and other services will be put under strain by this development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/406   Respondent: 8594721 / Mr Peter Eperon   Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I was totally surprised at the latest addition to the local plan for Send's future development. The development at Send Hill would obviously be built on Green Belt Land and is totally unsuitable for this area.

I object for the following reasons:

1. Send Hill is a very narrow lane and, in particular, where this proposed site will be there is absolutely no room for two vehicles to pass each other. If this proposal was accepted, the road would have to be widened, at considerable cost, to enable lorries and caravans to go back and forth on this site. The sewage in Winds Ridge and Send Hill has always been a problem and as Winds Ridge is at a lower level, with excess effluence, there is considerable back up on our property which has to be cleaned on a regular basis. This will only be exacerbated by additional properties.

2. The privately owner part of this development, over recent years, has become a haven for wild life with deer, badgers, bee orchids and various species of birds.

3. When this piece of land was sold to the present owner there was a Covenant that a corner of this plot should not be disturbed as it was used as a dog and pet cemetery. If this is built on, surely this is breaking the lease.
4. The GBC area of this development has been used for many years - to my knowledge well over twenty years - for recreation, children and dog walkers.

5. Previously the land was used as a waste infill. This infill was extremely toxic and has been vented over a period of time. If building was to take place, surely this would disturb any existing toxicity in the ground which could result in serious problems. This could be one risk too far!

6. The cemetery enlargement in Send Hill, which has now been offered to all denominations will, in itself, increase both traffic and parking problems and there would be added chaos to your proposed development. If you take into consideration the traffic from schools and their latest rebuilds, this will also increase the traffic problems. By the riding stables in Send Hill the road gets even narrower and is very dangerous leading into Potters Lane.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| PSLPS16/797 | Mrs Pippa Fleming | | Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44 | 11. I object to the inclusion of land west of Wind Ridge and Send Hill designated for 40 homes and 2 Travellers' Pitches (Policy A44). The site was not included in Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon prior to the inclusion in the Regulation 18 draft and has not consulted upon prior to the inclusion in the 2016 Local Plan.  
12. I object to the impact of Policy A44 on an area of beautiful Green Belt countryside.  
13. I object to the impact of Policy A44 as the subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented.  
14. I object to the impact of Policy A44, which includes 2 Traveller's Pitches, on the local infrastructure. The narrow width single track country road provides insufficient access for the pitches. What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? Attached documents: |
| PSLPS16/7655 | Mrs Sarah Tipping | | Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44 | I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site. What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? Attached documents: |
| PSLPS16/4798 | Julian Cranwell | | Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44 | Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |
We object to policy A44 Send Hill. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints. The proposed development is not sustainable because of poor infrastructure. Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site for travellers or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring. The site is a high quality green belt amenity area within beautiful surrounding countryside and would be spoilt by the development. A Wasteland Solutions environmental report on Send Hill dated March 2004 gave evidence of past ponding of water in the excavated area. Further development would disturb the water table and increase risk of flooding to surrounding properties. The site was used as a GBC registered landfill site and shown on the 1963-8 Ordnance Survey maps as “refuse and slag heap”. It is therefore unsuitable for such development on health reasons. On the 1971 Ordnance Survey the site is shown as a “refuse tip” prior to when proper licensing/registration was required. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. We therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials. GBC has installed gas monitoring wells on site since July 2000. One well recording methane gas discharge. A Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005 Identifies the proposed site as GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/11/LLC with type of waste not identified. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. We therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials. A Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005 Identifies proposed site GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/12 with type of waste identified as “unrestricted”. This causes concern as to what it does contain and the dangers if disturbed. An Envirosearch Report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004 and historical map data and information from GBC has identified the site as landfill and has “areas of potentially contaminative industrial activities” and “potential risk from landfill gas migrations”. Development of this site would be a health hazard.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
This site is previously Land Fill.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2584</th>
<th>Respondent: 8729313 / Lisa Wright</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A44</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object as my previous comments have not been resolved. This is an old land fill site, is greenbelt, and provides some much needed public space for walkers etc.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1315</th>
<th>Respondent: 8746753 / Miles Hackett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the development of land west of Winds ridge and send hill.

This site was not included in the Regulation 18 draft local plan so has not had full consultation. The site to my knowledge contains documented unsafe landfill waste which was registered with Guildford borough council.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/81</th>
<th>Respondent: 8793025 / Janet Manktelow</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy A44 Land to the west of Winds ridge and Send Hill

It is proposed to build forty houses and two traveller pitches.

This land is predominantly an infilled sand and gravel pit. It was filled over several years and still has venting points. The land is now partly farmed and grazed. It is a beautiful site which affords distant view from Potters Lane, Send. These lovely views would be totally altered. From the Send Hill side footpath there are distant views of the Surrey Hills. It probably represents backland development.
Send Hill is a very narrow lane and access to a small estate would be unsuitable. The site is not a sensible place for traveller pitches either as the access would be even worse for long vehicles. It is a mile from the village shops and bus stops.

Insetting the settlement boundary at both the St Bedes School site and the Wey Navigation at Send Road is totally unreasonable. This change would remove both areas from the Green Belt and render it open to permitting even more development in the village.

The land adjacent to Heath Drive is also part of the Wey Navigation Corridor. It is currently home to a great deal of wildlife. Fox, deer, badgers, owls and many other birds are found here on a frequent basis. The pleasant views when cruising on the Navigation will be totally lost if this change takes place.

The land at St Bedes School off of Bush Lane will be prime development land if this is allowed to happen. Again a valuable piece of Green Belt is involved here. A footpath runs through and allows the sight of nature in the wild. Buzzards, Kites, Skylarks and many other species along with deer, foxes etc., can be seen here. The time expired Junior school is currently being rebuilt on a nearby site and the current Junior school plan states it is to be returned to a green field. There is no exceptional reason for this to be changed.

I am disappointed that these sites have been included in the Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/853  **Respondent:** 8800705 / Michael Cumper  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the new site known as Land West of Winds Ridge and Send Hill for both housing and travellers sites. This countryside is inappropriate for housing, it has an area of unsafe, vented land fill and the siting of travellers where there is a narrow width single track country road is impractical at best.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2184  **Respondent:** 8803617 / Timothy Bruton  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

2.4 A44 Lands at Winds Ridge.

I object to this development. This land is unsuitable for development being land fill with active waste management still in place. The site will have a negative visual impact being clearly visible from the Wey Navigation Corridor and Potter’s Lane. Access to the site is very poor being single lane from Potters lane and very narrow from May’s Corner traffic lights with cars frequently parked restricting access.

[IMAGE 1]

Figure 1 Lorry attempting to enter Tannery Lane from Send Road

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPS16/2490  Respondent: 8817537 / Kim Meredith  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site allocation A44 Send Hill as it is documented as having unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3013  Respondent: 8828385 / Thomas Meredith  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill as it contains unsafe land fill waste and is in the middle of the beautiful Green Belt which should be conserved. The road to this area is of single width and totally unsuitable for regular heavy traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7120  Respondent: 8828929 / Janice Hurdle  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I also object to Policy 44 - the proposed development on Send Hill, which was also not included in the draft plan, as the road narrows considerably where the proposed development is planned. Any development there would spoil this area which is set in beautiful countryside & should be protected as it is Green Belt. The site is also unsuitable as a travellers’ site as it is over a mile from the amenities of the village centre in a very quiet area.

You have broken the promises that were made at the last election and I am sincerely disappointed in the actions of the councillors on Guildford Borough Council. I sincerely hope that you will take note of my comments & revise the recommendations in the Local Plan. If you do not, then Send will be changed forever.

Please pass this letter on to the Planning Inspector as the significant changes you have proposed require another full consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7632  Respondent: 8837729 / Harry Clarke  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Policy A44 (Send) – Object
   1. Loss of Green Belt Land
   2. Extension of Settlement Area of Send

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/78  Respondent: 8838337 / Gregory Webb  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Policy A44.
   1. This is also a NEW site that was not included in the Regulation 18 draft.
   2. Development for housing is inappropriate due to the area’s permanent Green Belt status
   3. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe landfill
   4. The proposal to include 2 Traveller Pitches is inappropriate due the narrow road width and restricted access.

I trust that these comments will be given full consideration and that GBC will amend the local plan to remove the proposed developments referenced above that would irreparably damage the villages of Send and Ripley and alter the character of the whole Borough.

GBC needs to develop a Local Plan with significantly less new housing based upon a realistic increase in permanent population for the Borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1931  Respondent: 8839521 / Lynn Yeo  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to OBJECT to the inclusion of Site 44, Land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill, in the current draft of the Local Plan. This site is new and there has not been any previous consultation on it as was not included in any of the previous draft versions of the Local Plan. This site consists of 40 homes and 2 traveller pitches and constitutes a significant change and should require a full consultation under Regulation 18, not the short cut of Regulation 19.

The scale and type of development at this site is inappropriate due to its location in a high quality Green Belt area, within an area of beautiful countryside. I believe that the subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe landfill waste which is currently vented. New houses should not be constructed on this land as its disruption may release toxins which put the health of existing and future residents at risk.

Due to the reasons stated above, Site 44 should be removed from the final version of the Local Plan. I would like the Inspector to see my comments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I am writing to OBJECT to the inclusion of Site 44, Land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill, in the current draft of the Local Plan. This site is new and there has not been any previous consultation on it as was not included in any of the previous draft versions of the Local Plan. This site consists of 40 homes and 2 traveller pitches and constitutes a significant change and should require a full consultation under Regulation 18, not the short route of Regulation 19.

The scale and type of development at this site is inappropriate due to its location in a high quality Green Belt area, within an area of beautiful countryside (see attached photos). The proposed density of housing is not in keeping with the surroundings.

I believe that the subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe landfill waste which is currently vented. New houses should not be constructed on this land without a thorough decontamination plan followed by many years of rest.

It is unclear how all of the proposed dwellings will fit on such a plot which is currently an asset to the local community: it is used by wildlife, as a buffer between homes and farmland, and for dog walking.

I believe that the site is too far (1.2km walk) from local shops to be practical for a traveller site.

I would like to point out that this proposal (in combining a traveller site with additional housing, on land which is being inset) contravenes Planning Policy for traveller sites Policy E: Traveller sites in Green Belt which reads:

“14. Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

1. Green Belt boundaries should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. If a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (which might be to accommodate a site inset within the Green Belt) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan-making process and not in response to a planning application. If land is removed from the Green Belt in this way, it should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only.”

Due to the reasons stated above, Site 44 should be removed from the final version of the Local Plan. I would like the Inspector to see my comments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
### Comment ID: PSLPS16/1003  Respondent: 8848033 / Paul Gerrard  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

*Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?* ( ), *is Sound?* ( ), *is Legally Compliant?* ( No )

I object to housing on this site. It is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, and therefore any development is subject to EU/UK legislation (NPPF 119). The impact cannot be mitigated with SANGs because there is no evidence base to support SANGs as required by NRM6 viii, NPPF 158 and 166.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

### Comment ID: PSLPS16/2756  Respondent: 8853025 / Charles Gibson  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

*Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?* ( ), *is Sound?* ( ), *is Legally Compliant?* ( )

1. I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

### Comment ID: PSLPS16/7594  Respondent: 8853025 / Charles Gibson  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

*Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?* ( ), *is Sound?* ( ), *is Legally Compliant?* ( )

I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

### Comment ID: PSLPS16/6614  Respondent: 8854785 / Desmond McCann  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

*Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?* ( ), *is Sound?* ( ), *is Legally Compliant?* ( )

I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/8024</th>
<th>Respondent: 8858113 / Ramsey Nagaty</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to policy A44 Send Hill

There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

The proposed development is not sustainable because of poor infrastructure. Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site for travellers or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.

The site is a high quality green belt amenity area within beautiful surrounding countryside and would be spoilt by the development.

A Wasteland Solutions environmental report on Send Hill dated March 2004 gave evidence of past ponding of water in the excavated area. Further development would disturb the water table and increase risk of flooding to surrounding properties.

The site was used as a GBC registered landfill site and shown on the 1963-8 Ordnance Survey maps as “refuse and slag heap”. It is therefore unsuitable for such a development on health reasons.

On the 1971 Ordnance Survey the site is shown as a “refuse tip” prior to when proper licensing/registration was required. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. WEtherefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials.

GBC has installed gas monitoring wells on site since July 2000. One well recording methane gas discharge.

A Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005-Identifies the proposed site as GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/11/LLC with type of waste not identified. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. WEtherefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials.

A Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005-Identifies proposed site GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/12 with type of waste identified as “unrestricted”. This causes concern as to what it does contain and the dangers if disturbed.

An Envirosearch Report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004 and historical map data and information from GBC has identified the site as landfill and has “areas of potentially contaminative industrial activities” and “potential risk from landfill gas migrations”. Development of this site would be a health hazard.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7313</th>
<th>Respondent: 8859585 / Claire Yates</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill. This is a former land fill site, which still contains 'hazardous to health' substances. The Local Schools and Doctors Surgery would be oversubscribed. The newly amalgamated Send School has no capacity for further pupils, and it is already difficult to get an appointment with the GP surgery.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1632  Respondent: 8880929 / Maurice Dawes  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to it's high quality Green Belt amenity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7661  Respondent: 8893057 / Dianne Garnett  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1.1  **We object** to policy A44 Send Hill

1.2  There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

1.3  The proposed development is not sustainable because of poor infrastructure. Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site for travellers or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.

1.4  The site is a high quality green belt amenity area within beautiful surrounding countryside and would be spoilt by the development.

1.5  A Wasteland Solutions environmental report on Send Hill dated March 2004 gave evidence of past ponding of water in the excavated area. Further development would disturb the water table and increase risk of flooding to surrounding properties.

1.6  The site was used as a GBC registered landfill site and shown on the 1963-8 Ordnance Survey maps as “refuse and slag heap”. It is therefore unsuitable for such a development on health reasons.

1.7  On the 1971 Ordnance Survey the site is shown as a “refuse tip” prior to when proper licensing/registration was required. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. We therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials.

1.8  GBC has installed gas monitoring wells on site since July 2000. One well recording methane gas discharge.

1.9  A Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005-Identifies the proposed site as GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/11/LLC with type of waste not identified. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. We therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials.
1.10 A Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005 identifies proposed site GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/12 with type of waste identified as “unrestricted”. This causes concern as to what it does contain and the dangers if disturbed.

1.11 An Envirossearch Report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004 and historical map data and information from GBC has identified the site as landfill and has “areas of potentially contaminative industrial activities” and “potential risk from landfill gas migrations”. Development of this site would be a health hazard.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1715   Respondent: 8899489 / A.A. White   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the housing proposal at Send Hill/Winds Ridge. The Plan acknowledges former quarry workings but makes no mention of the land being contaminated by landfill. Neither does it refer to the venting of the land to dispel underground gases.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/409   Respondent: 8901121 / Sandra Peter Eperon   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I was totally surprised at the latest addition to the local plan for Send's future development. The development at Send Hill would obviously be built on Green Belt Land and is totally unsuitable for this area.

I object for the following reasons:

1. Send Hill is a very narrow lane and, in particular, where this proposed site will be there is absolutely no room for two vehicles to pass each other. If this proposal was accepted, the road would have to be widened, at considerable cost, to enable lorries and caravans to go back and forth on this site. Winds Ridge has always had drainage problems and these will be exacerbated by extra properties in Send Hill.

2. The privately owner part of this development, over recent years, has become a haven for wild life with deer, badgers and various species of birds.

3. When this piece of land was sold to the present owner there was a Covenant that a corner of this plot should not be disturbed as it was used as a dog and pet cemetery If this is built on, surely this is breaking the lease.
4. The GBC area of this development has been used for many years - to my knowledge well over twenty years - for recreation, children and dog walkers.

5. Previously the land was used as a waste infill. This infill was extremely toxic and has been vented over a period of time. If building was to take place, surely this would disturb any existing toxicity in the ground which could result in serious problems. This could be one risk too far!

6. The cemetery enlargement in Send Hill, which has now been offered to all denominations will, in itself, increase both traffic and parking problems and there would be added chaos on your proposed development. If you take into consideration the traffic from schools and their latest rebuilds, this will also increase the traffic problems. By the riding stables in Send Hill the road gets even narrower and is very dangerous leading into Potters Lane.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2176  **Respondent:** 8907905 / G.A. Phillips  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

3. I OBJECT to the development of Send Hill.

I object to the proposal in the Local Plan on the grounds that a Wasteland Solutions environmental report on Send Hill dated March 2004 gave evidence of past ponding of water in the excavated area. Further development would disturb water table and increase the risk flooding to nearby properties.

The proposed site was used by GBC as a landfill site (and not a quarry as stated elsewhere) and on ordnance survey maps it is marked as "refuse and slag heap". Any disturbance to the site would be a health hazard due to the unknown materials. It is therefore unsuitable for such a development due to health reasons.

Since July 2000, GBC installed Gas Monitoring wells. One well recording methane gas discharge. A recent newspaper article on how the dangers of living near landfill sites raises cancer concerns. Send Hill is a single track country lane and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2317  **Respondent:** 8914049 / Diana Bridges  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Specific Comments about Policy A44: Land west of Send Hill (page 225)

I know this area well and I grew up nearby. Whilst I recognise there may be some people who wish to object to this site I would like to put forward a more positive viewpoint in respect to possible development, although I offer some reservations as well.
1. The plan suggests the total site may be able to support approximately 40 houses but looking at the area and allowing for access roads to be built within the site, I feel this is a little optimistic. A figure of between 15 to 20 homes could be more realistic.

1. The development of the site should not aim to be high density or high rise. It should be in keeping with the rest of Send Hill and Winds Ridge which would mean either chalet bungalows and smaller houses, with maybe one or two large 4 or 5 bedroom houses added on slightly larger plots to enhance the overall appearance of the site.

1. The proposal to incorporate two traveller pitches as part of a mixed development would seem to be questionable. This site is the ONLY proposed mixed site in the whole of the Draft Local Plan for the Borough and in this regard would seem to be out of context in terms of mixed use compared to the other proposed sites.

If GBC were to develop the site as a mixed site then this would seem to contradict their main directive which is to ensure the best return on assets owned by the tax payer. This is because a close proximity mixed site would potentially mean a lower overall return on the final selling prices achieved for such a development. If this were the case, and was reflected by the mood of potential buyers, and borne out by final house sale prices, then this would be potentially a loss to the tax payer of several hundred thousand pounds. This could be interpreted as ill-conceived and irresponsible of GBC if this were to be reviewed at a future date and questions could be sought.

Considering the site overall, it would seem a better solution over all not to make this a mixed site and transfer the traveller sites to a more suitable location and one where it is concentrated on a traveller site only on one of the other proposed sites.

1. I object to the inclusion of two travellers pitches on this site which would be in contravention of your own stated policy of having a ratio of two such pitches for every 500 houses
2. Traveller issues have arisen in Send several times over the years and Send residents and our Parish Council have expressed their views many times to you the Guildford Borough Council and I find it very disappointing that you do not seem to heed our views and now again insist on trying to locate two pitches in a most unsuitable location. [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it]
3. If the development was on a smaller scale then the impact on Send Hill would be considerably reduced. Send Hill and the roads off it are very quiet and this is the main appeal of the area. The addition of 15 to 20 more homes would not represent a large increase in road traffic or impact the existing residents.
4. It is true that that Send Hill is a single track country road but with sensible planning and a low density development I do not see this as causing any problems to the existing residents or making a dramatic impact. By contrast, if it were to be a high density development then I think the opposite would be true.
5. The land is in greenbelt and I am a big supporter of keeping the greenbelt and not allowing wide scale development. However, this site when viewed on the map could be considered as an extension of the existing housing line of Send Hill. The site is surrounded by mature oak trees which should remain and is bound on two sides by a footpath which should also remain. This means that the surrounding open fields are all kept intact and the views are unaltered, so residents, dog walkers and members of the public can continue to enjoy the amenity.
6. The sensible development of this site, being at the top of the hill and the highest point, means it would not not be subject to flooding and would not be detrimental to the community and increased flood risk.
7. I understand that the land has been infilled over time and it has laid fallow for over 30 years. At one end of the field, the land owned by Guildford Borough Council, which is the main area of infill, there are methane vents. Further environmental tests may need to be reviewed to determine the exact position of any possible continued contamination.
8. By contrast, the far end of the field, closest to the cemetery, and not owned by GBC, this land has not been infilled as I understand it and recent environmental reports (dated as recently as 2015) seem to suggest that there is no contamination on this land. If this is the case, then perhaps this area could be considered for responsible, small scale development, to be in keeping with the current housing line.

I would like to place on record my objections which I would like to be seen by the Inspector.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2926  Respondent: 8914049 / Diana Bridges  Agent:
Policy A44 : Land west of Send Hill (page 225)

I object to the inclusion of two travellers pitches on this site which would be in contravention of your own stated policy of having a ratio of two such pitches for every 500 houses.

It is possible that the widening of the Send Hill road would encroach on the area of the site thus reducing its capacity for 40 houses assuming it could even accommodate as many as that which is doubtful. Two pitches among so few houses would certainly have a negative effect on the value of any houses built there and would certainly not secure the best return on the tax payers investment on the land.

Send Hill is certainly not a suitable location for travellers anyway access being difficult from the traffic lights especially with cars parked on one side opposite the school and on the brow of the hill making the approach quite hazardous.

In addition, there is a school at the bottom of Send Hill and at peak school times it is very congested with parents dropping their children. By travellers driving their vehicles with caravans making a long vehicle with potential blind spots then this will only heighten the risk of safety for parents and children.

However, a much smaller development without traveller pitches and in keeping with the surrounding properties could be a possibility. This would be a natural extension of the housing building line up Send Hill and could provide a development in-keeping with the rest of the area.

Traveller issues have arisen on several times over the years and Send residents and our Parish Council have expressed their views many times to you the Guildford Borough Council and GBC do not seem to heed our views and now again insist on trying to locate two pitches in a most unsuitable location. These pitches appear to have been randomly dropped into this area as they were originally in the centre of the village in Wharf Lane, which was another equally ill conceived area to site them.

[Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it]

The Local Plan is lacking evidence and detail

I feel there is a big disconnect between the requirements most residents feel they need and the locations they would sight developments against the methods employed by GBC and the seemingly alarming developments proposed.

The plan is considerably lacking in details which does nothing to help the residents who ultimately will determine the plan as a collective. For example

1. There is no explanation of why so much housing capacity is required in this area and who it is for
2. There are no artist’s impressions of how a development might look or any idea given of what an "affordable house" looks like
3. What is a traveller's pitch ?
4. Are there any conditions attached to the allocation of travellers ?
5. How are they to be managed? How are services arranged and paid for?
6. What term do the travellers stay for? Is there a minimum or maximum?

I feel if these questions could be answered then I would be better informed and could make a better decision.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Policy A44: Land west of Send Hill (page 225)

I object to the inclusion of two travellers pitches on this site which would be in contravention of your own stated policy of having a ratio of two such pitches for every 500 houses.

It is possible that the widening of the Send Hill road would encroach on the area of the site thus reducing its capacity for 40 houses assuming it could even accommodate as many as that which is doubtful. Two pitches among so few houses would certainly have a negative effect on the value of any houses built there and would certainly not secure the best return on the tax payers investment on the land.

Send Hill is certainly not a suitable location for travellers anyway access being difficult from the traffic lights especially with cars parked on one side opposite the school and on the brow of the hill making the approach quite hazardous.

In addition, there is a school at the bottom of Send Hill and at peak school times it is very congested with parents dropping their children. By travellers driving their vehicles with caravans making a long vehicle with potential blind spots then this will only heighten the risk of safety for parents and children.

However, a much smaller development without traveller pitches and in keeping with the surrounding properties could be a possibility. This would be a natural extension of the housing building line up Send Hill and could provide a development in-keeping with the rest of the area.

Traveller issues have arisen in Send several times over the years and Send residents and our Parish Council have expressed their views many times to Guildford Borough Council and GBC do not seem to heed our views and now again insist on trying to locate two pitches in a most unsuitable location. These pitches appear to have been randomly dropped into this area as they were originally in the centre of the village in Wharf Lane, which was another equally ill conceived area to site them.

[Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it]

The Local Plan is lacking evidence and detail

I feel there is a big disconnect between the requirements most residents feel they need and the locations they would sight developments against the methods employed by GBC and the seemingly alarming developments proposed.

The plan is considerably lacking in details which does nothing to help the residents who ultimately will determine the plan as a collective. For example

1. There is no explanation of why so much housing capacity is required in this area and who it is for.
2. There are no artist's impressions of how a development might look or any idea given of what an Maffordable house" looks like.
3. What is a traveller's pitch?
4. Are there any conditions attached to the allocation of travellers pitches?
5. How are they to be managed? How are services arranged and paid for?
6. What term do the travellers stay for? Is there a minimum or maximum?

I feel if these questions could be answered then I would be better informed and could make a better decision.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Policy A44: Land west of Send Hill (page 225)

I object to the inclusion of two travellers pitches on this site which would be in contravention of your own stated policy of having a ratio of two such pitches for every 500 houses.

It is possible that the widening of the Send Hill road would encroach on the area of the site thus reducing its capacity for 40 houses assuming it could even accommodate as many as that which is doubtful. Two pitches among so few houses would certainly have a negative effect on the value of any houses built there and would certainly not secure the best return on the tax payers investment on the land.

Send Hill is certainly not a suitable location for travellers anyway access being difficult from the traffic lights especially with cars parked on one side opposite the school and on the brow of the hill making the approach quite hazardous.

In addition, there is a school at the bottom of Send Hill and at peak school times it is very congested with parents dropping their children. By travellers driving their vehicles with caravans making a long vehicle with potential blind spots then this will only heighten the risk of safety for parents and children.

However, a much smaller development without traveller pitches and in keeping with the surrounding properties could be a possibility. This would be a natural extension of the housing building line up Send Hill and could provide a development in-keeping with the rest of the area.

Traveller issues have arisen in Send several times over the years and Send residents and our Parish Council have expressed their views many times to Guildford Borough Council and GBC do not seem to heed our views and now again insist on trying to locate two pitches in a most unsuitable location. These pitches appear to have been randomly dropped into this area as they were originally in the centre of the village in Wharf Lane, which was another equally ill conceived area to site them.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4994  Respondent: 8954977 / Patrick Sheard  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the building of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill. Send Hill is an inappropriate location for development of this scale because of the narrow width of the access road. The sub-soil of the proposed site contains unsafe landfill waste registered with Guildford Borough Council and would lay the Council open to legal action were there to be any untoward leakage from the site and possible claims of discrimination.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5664  Respondent: 9320289 / David Francis  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy a44 land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill for 40 homes and 2 travellers pitches. This local amenity is well used by the local community and is also an old landfill site. It has green belt status and a beautiful area of countryside would be spoilt by any development. Any disturbance of this old landfill site is potentially dangerous.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3918  Respondent: 9323361 / Paul Holden  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• I object to housing development at Send Hill,
all of these sites being unsuitable and in the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3037  Respondent: 10447777 / J Jordan  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to Send and Ripley being taken out of the Green Belt. Having been assured by Cameron that he would protect the Green Belt, suddenly Send and Ripley are removed. On whose authorisation and for what reason. The narrow boat marina has already been approved and to be built on Green Belt land. When the Green Belt is built on it is gone forever and Send and Ripley will become part of the general sprawl linking to Guildford and Woking.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/707  Respondent: 10447969 / John and Angela Symonds  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I also object most strongly to the Winds Ridge, Send Hill Site. 40 more homes and 2 travellers site would be totally unacceptable in what is a quiet country lane and no pavements. The plot many years ago was used as a landfill site and has vents, surely providing a point that this is not a suitable area to build on top of which - once again is green belt!

I thought our problems would be eased after the last council of Mansbridge [text unreadable]. It appears not.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6934  Respondent: 10551617 / L Truscott  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A44 Winds Ridge, this land is in the green belt and access to the proposed site is via Send Hill which a narrow road with no pedestrian pavements. The houses on this site will alter the beautiful views across the fields and grazing land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3488  Respondent: 10563457 / John Creasey  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of consultation with Send unlike the rest of the borough regarding proposed sites as they were not included in the previous consultation in 2014.

I object to the development at send Hill of 40 houses as this is close to an area of beautiful countryside and is in a GreenBelt of high quality.

I object to all the proposals as Send Is a small village and no thought or planning seems to have been carried out as to infrastructure including the flooding which occurs in certain parts of the village, increased traffic, schools for the influx of children, Doctors surgery, Buses which do not pass the Doctors Surgery which covers Ripley, Clandon, Send and other local villages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Co-operate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSLPS16/1101</td>
<td>10563777 / Hazel Creasey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td>I object to the proposed two traveller's pitches on land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill as this is a new proposal and has not been consulted upon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSLPS16/3137</td>
<td>10570049 / Jenny Peachey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td>Site A44 - I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pslp172/603</td>
<td>10570049 / Jenny Peachey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A44</td>
<td>Site A44 - I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSLPS16/5965</td>
<td>10627681 / John Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the development of the Travellers pitches at Send Hill as this area is not very accessible being a single track country road in part.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6056  Respondent: 10644417 / D Hill  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The site at the top of Send Hill also has no capacity for additional traffic. Both of these roads are accessed by Send Road or tiny lanes with few passing points. The lack of decent public transport in Send means that cars are essential with a lot of families needing 2 or more vehicles.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6665  Respondent: 10670529 / Jennifer McIndoe  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill because of the restricted access to the site and I understand that the subsoil of the proposed site contains unsafe landfill waste.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2222  Respondent: 10683457 / Margaret Bruton  Agent:
I object to this development. This land is unsuitable for development being land fill with active waste management still in place. The site will have a negative visual impact being clearly visible from the Wey Navigation Corridor and Potter’s Lane. Access to the site is very poor being single lane from Potters lane and very narrow from May’s Corner traffic lights with cars frequently parked restricting access.

[IMAGE 1]

Figure 1 Lorry attempting to enter Tannery Lane from Send Road

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: IMAGE_1.jpg (35 KB)

---

In respect to the Send Hill proposed development site (A44):

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the proposed site has previously been used as a land fill site with unknown materials buried there. Any disturbance could lead to health hazards to current and future occupants of
Send Hill.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that access from Potters lane is via a single track lane, totally unsuited to anything but light vehicles. The steep single lane hill at the junction is in permanent shade during winter months and is frequently sheeted in ice resulting from run off throughout night and day for prolonged periods. The idea of a travellers site with attendant towing of large loads is of major concern on safety grounds.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the site is in the greenbelt. Furthermore, it is not even within the existing Send village boundary, so even the outrageous idea of insetting greenbelt villages does not lend any justification to developing the site.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the proposed scale of developments in Send would increase the stress already placed on the local services and further increase traffic congestion that is already a daily problem for Send residents.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that it would detrimentally impact Send's existing village identity.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the proposed site is not large enough for the proposed use.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that Guildford borough already has a higher proportion of traveller sites than most comparable boroughs. Over-provision is inappropriate given other constraints.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1612  **Respondent:** 10721089 / Y Beraud  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to policy A44.1.9ha land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill designated For 40 houses and 2 Travellers Pitches, this site is new and was not included in the regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously. Development for housing is inappropriate due to its permanent Green Belt status and high quality Green Belt amenity. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. Also the proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4012  **Respondent:** 10721473 / David French  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A44 Land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill - 40 houses. Again it is on a narrow country lane not suitable for increased traffic. The land is also contaminated by landfill. Would you want to live there?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/3539</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>10721537 / Stephen Niblett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td>I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to the subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is totally inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road which would afford insufficient access to the site.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/2634</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>10722593 / D.C. Johnson-Webb</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td>I object to the proposed building of 40 homes and 2 travelers Pitches on land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill. This is a land fill waste site which is currently vented there is also poor access to the site due to single track country road one end and the school the other end. Policy A44. 1.9 ha</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/1182</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>10723169 / Alan Barnes</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td>I object to the new housing plans for Send for the following reasons. The proposed building land in SEND HILL was infilled with rubbish and not suitable to build on. The road up Send Hill is not big enough or well illuminated to cope with the increased traffic. {we have only 2 street lamps in the whole of the road from Mays corner to Potters lane] The local amenities are already overstretched Doctors and schools etc. More building will make Send even more liable to flooding.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/3200</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>10724769 / P. Broughton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/216  Respondent: 10727009 / A. Elms  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of Land West of Winds Ridge and Send Hill, Policy A44

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/403  Respondent: 10727009 / A. Elms  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I also note that there are other new inclusions under Policy A44 for the inclusion of 40 homes and 2 travellers' pitches. This is absolute madness to build on landfill. Breathing pipes are in place to vent the landfill. People who live there would suffer ill health. The lanes around there are far too small to cope with travellers and their caravans. It is a country lane and unfit for development.

In addition procedural regulations have now been followed. This should have been put out for fuller consultation under Regulation 18.

I object to the development of Land West of Winds Ridge and Send Hill, Policy A44 for 40 new homes and two Travellers' Pitches.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5295  Respondent: 10727489 / Gaynor Eke  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I PARTICULARLY OBJECT to the proposal in Policy A44 of the local plan Land West of Winds Ridge and Send Hill on the grounds that:

• The site is not large enough for the proposed use.
• The siting of two travellers pitches in Send Hill will be detrimental to both Send Hill and the Send/Ripley areas with house values and people’s desire to move into the area adversely affected.
• Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.
• Send is in green belt. The proposed inset is inappropriate due to its permanent green belt status and would be spoilt by development.
• The existing road and parking infrastructure is already inadequate or under pressure and could worsen with the planned development, reducing quality of life.
• Too many houses are proposed to Send/ Send Marsh are and the impact on traffic congestion and local services would be unacceptable.
• The proposed number of houses potentially could result in 92 extra cars in Send Hill which is already suffering from congestion particularly at school run time.
• This would cause loss of village identity, be detrimental to the community and increased flood risk.
• A Wasteland Solutions environmental report on Send Hill dated March 2004 gave evidence of past ponding of water in the excavated area. Further development would disturb water table and increase risk of flooding to properties.
• GBC has installed gas monitoring wells on site since July 2000. One well recording methane gas discharge.
• Both the Envirosrch Report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004 and historical map data and information from GBC has identified site as landfill and has “areas of potentially contaminative industrial activities”. Development of this site would be a health hazard.
• The Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005-Identifies proposed site as a local authorised landfill site as licences under Part II of Environmental protection Act 1990. The proposed site is not a quarry as specified in the GBC Local Plan. And is therefore not suitable for the proposed usage. It also Identifies proposed site as potentially contaminative industrial land. With usage of “Heap and unknown constituents”. This causes concern as to what it does contain and dangers if disturbed

Overall, I OBJECT to the Local Plan. I would like these comments to be seen and considered by a planning inspector.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the possible loss of a beauty spot which is only accessible at present by footpaths and which is enjoyed by people in the village and visitors.

I object to adding to the increase in the number of residents in the village (as there are other housing proposals throughout the village) because of the pressure on the already stretched medical and educational facilities in the village.

On the other hand a small development, without Travellers pitches, and in keeping with the surrounding properties, on the privately owned land that was never infilled could be a possibility.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3989  Respondent: 10728321 / Michael Randles  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill being removed from the Green Belt to provide 40 homes and 2 travellers pitches. This is a new site and not included in the regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted upon previously. Part of the site is contaminated. I remember, some years ago asking a long term resident of Send (a highly respected partner in a local building company) if he knew why the mature trees along by the footpath were dying and he replied that highly toxic material had been dumped in what had been a landfill site. This had not been removed but merely covered by earth which should never be disturbed as it would be a danger to anyone involved. As far as I can tell vents were not placed near where these trees died. The upper part of the site has become a wildlife haven where deer have their young, badgers and foxes have been seen ‘and many birds find protection.

I OBJECT ALSO TO the provision of travellers’ sites to the rear of houses in Send Hill where there have been none before. The sites appear to include the footpath used by me and other local people as a short-cut into Send Village. Surely the narrow single-track country road could not provide sufficient access to this site for often rather large caravans.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3855  Respondent: 10728353 / Pat Randles  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill being removed from the Green Belt to provide 40 homes and 2 travellers pitches. This is a new site and not included in the regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted upon previously. Part of the site is contaminated. I remember some years ago asking a long term resident of Send (a highly respected partner in a local building company) if he knew why the mature trees along by the footpath were dying and he replied that highly toxic material had been dumped in what had been a landfill site. This had not been removed but merely covered by earth which should never be disturbed as it would be a danger to anyone involved. As far as I can tell vents were not placed near where these trees died. The upper part of the site has become a wildlife haven where deer have their young, badgers and foxes have been seen ‘and many birds find protection.

I OBJECT ALSO TO the provision of travellers’ sites to the rear of houses in Send Hill where there have been none before. The sites appear to include the footpath used by me and other local people as a short-cut into Send Village. Surely the narrow single-track country road could not provide sufficient access to this site for often rather large caravans.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I write to object to parts of the Guildford Local Plan relating to Send Village.

I object for the following reasons:

1. The land is in green belt area and has not been previously built on and should not be used as a residential area
2. The area is on the quiet outskirts of the village and development would spoil the rural nature of the area
3. Send Hill access is a narrow road (very narrow and dangerous at one end) and is not suitable for the increased traffic
4. The area was previously used for landfill, with an incompletely known history. One gas monitoring well at the site has recorded methane discharge
5. The area is rich in wildlife including some rare and/or protected species such as badger and bee orchids
6. The area is used extensively by locals for recreation such as dog walking
7. The Envirosearch Report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004 identifies “potential risk from landfill gas migrations” which would be a health risk

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
In ‘A Local Plan for Local People’ (GBC’s publication about Guildford – Summer 2016), GBC states ‘Our revised plan is designed to protect and enhance the area whilst improving the borough for generations to come. Whether travelling by train, bus, car, bike or foot, the revised local plan aims to deliver a joined up local strategy. I object that as applied to Send, Ripley and other parts of Guildford, this publication by GBC is glib and lying nonsense.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2279  Respondent: 10729857 / Lynne Daniel  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill, as the road to this site is narrow and the additional volume of traffic will bring significant congestion at the traffic lights at the bottom of the hill

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5046  Respondent: 10732097 / Gillian Thomas  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

7. I object to the development in Send Hill as, again, it is in the Green Belt and is the land is unsafe land fill.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3877  Respondent: 10732193 / Leslie Bowerman  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have a number of objections to the proposal to include the site on Send Hill as follows:

I object to this site on the grounds that Send Hill is unsuitable in that it has a one-track road without pavements and with a school at one end and a narrow, steep and winding hill at the other end.

- I object to the inclusion of Send Hill in the Plan as it is in the Green Belt
- I object to Send Hill being included as it would have a detrimental effect on the nearby nature reserve.
- I object to Send Hill in the Plan as it could mean nearly 100 extra cars on this very narrow road which is often blocked due to parents delivering and collecting children from
- I object to Send Hill due to an increase in the risk of floodi
- I object strongly to the Send Hill site as it would disturb the water l
• I object to the Send Hill site in the Plan as it was a registered landfill site used for refuse and slag and is therefore a health risk. Methane gas has been recorded there.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2290  Respondent: 10733089 / Chris Barber  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• I object to the development of 40 houses & 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill, as the road to this site is narrow and the additional volume of traffic will bring significant congestion at the Send Hill traffic lights

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4429  Respondent: 10733121 / F. Buchhaus  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to --

40 houses and two travellers pitches at Send Hill

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1684  Respondent: 10733665 / David Elvey  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

10. I object to the development of 40 houses at Winds Ridge/Send Hill (Policy A44) as subsoil contains unsafe land fill waste.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6648  Respondent: 10733825 / Karen Thornton  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at send Hill

this would be completely inappropriate again because of the single track country lane that meets potters lane. Also, the subsoil on the site contains documented unsafe land fill waste. Please contact resident [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998] for a more detailed objection specifically about this site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6133</th>
<th>Respondent: 10734113 / A.H. Finn</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the proposed development of 40 houses and 2 Traveler’s pitches at Send Hill Site is not suitable for this due to Send Hill being very narrow at this point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3444</th>
<th>Respondent: 10736545 / Patricia Midson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Send Hill development it contains unsafe landfill waste as documented at GBC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3445</th>
<th>Respondent: 10736545 / Patricia Midson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In fact I object to GBC developers councilors making any awful changes as they all are to our lovely village.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/306</th>
<th>Respondent: 10741793 / Dianne Mathie</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I absolutely object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site. You must take note and be aware of the unsafe landfill waste and also the single track country lane issue and respond to these issues thoroughly.

I also strongly object to the building on the Green Belt at Send at Garlick’s Arch, Clockbarn Nurseries and Send Hill because it is not justified by any special circumstances and the fact that Green Belt is meant to be permanent and not continually eroded.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/510  Respondent: 10741793 / Dianne Mathie  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1565  Respondent: 10742753 / Debbie Leane  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill. This site is inappropriate due to the fact that access is only via a narrow single road. In addition to this, this site contains subsoil with documented unsafe landfill waste registered at GBC, and therefore is not a suitable location. This development will only spoil the current beautiful countryside we want to preserve in our village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/134  Respondent: 10746209 / Pauline Fava  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I strongly object to the land west of Winds Ridge and Send hill designated for 40 homes and 2 travellers pitches being built on. Again this is green belt with very poor access. Send Hill with a dangerous junction on to Potters Lane is single track.

Attached documents:
I am deeply saddened by GBC's outrageous way of treating its residents. Whilst I agree some low cost housing is needed you have failed yet again to take any notice of the views and wishes of Send and object to the plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3477</th>
<th>Respondent: 10749409 / B. Holmes</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traveller Sites and 40 Houses -1 object in the strongest terms to the proposed plan and set out below some of the reasons.

Send Hill is totally unsuitable for any increased traffic volume that would result from future housing developments and traveller sites as the road narrows to single width from Orchard Way down to Potters Lane and there is no pavement along the majority of the road. There are many walkers and cyclists who use this route. As I see it there is no government pressure to inset this site and no compelling reason for Guildford Borough Council to make this proposal at all. There are no special or exceptional circumstances for such a proposal.

Housing affordable or otherwise is in appropriate on this rural GreenBelt site as it will:

- Result in loss of established open view landscape.
- Result in increased traffic flow.
- Create a safety hazard for cyclists, pedestrians (Children, Walkers, Dog Walkers and Joggers).
- Disturb hazardous material underground etc.
- Require Infrastructure improvements.
- Disturb the peace & tranquillity of the area.
- Adversely affect the character and quality of life.
- Increase noise pollution.
- Disturb the natural habitat/wildlife.

- Send Hill is a peaceful residential road with open views comprising a mixture of bungalows and houses with a fair proportion of elderly and vulnerable inhabitants and a junior school at the bottom of the road. The idea of a Travellersite and or housing in this location will detrimentally alter the character of the area and is highly inappropriate. Any such developments would be removing existing open space and greenbelt, not protecting it.

- The road is very narrow i.e. single track at the point of the proposed site i.e. two cars are unable to pass, and it would be unsuitable for access to the site. Turning left from such a site into the narrow road is blind and would be a danger to pedestrians, cyclists and other motor vehicles. The opening up of access to this site would have further undesirable consequences on the open land further along the road.

- Parking for the junior school in Send Hill is a considerable hazard with only enough space for one vehicle to pass during pick-up times and the additional traffic resulting from any developments will simply amplify the dangers.

- Development of this site and other allocations in Send will undoubtedly result in serious infrastructure deficiencies which would destroy the Village. Any disturbance to the ground for foundations or utility services would require a geo technical survey and remediation work to be carried out. I doubt drainage, sewerage and water supply pressure capability for any new development.
The proposed site is an old landfill land believed to contain hazardous materials, including rumoured asbestos, cadmium and mercury. Any disturbance of the ground for building or services is therefore a potential health hazard. My understanding is that a geo survey would have to be undertaken along with likely remediation work before any disturbance could even be considered.

Public transport is very limited. It is approximately half a mile walk to the nearest Bus Stop and the services to Woking and Guildford are not very frequent. The nearest Stations are Woking and Clandon both of which are difficult to get to without a car. The main roads to both are narrow and busy, particularly so at rush hour and unsuitable for safe cycling. It is highly unlikely that this could be changed.

This proposed site is not surrounded by existing housing and would clearly impinge on the openness of this piece of Green Belt. Indeed the site is open on three sides with existing housing on one side only with a public foot path in between. Therefore any developments here would totally inappropriate.

Any development on this site would destroy the character and open landscape of the area. Coupled with other site allocation proposals in Send, and adjoining lovelace and Woking, will clearly over burden the infrastructure to an unsustainable level.

This is a Green Belt Outside Settlement Boundary site and any development would result in the loss of the visual landscape from overlooking houses such as ours, ramblers, dog walkers and pedestrians. Other reasons are stated elsewhere in this document.

This open space is used by many dog walkers, local ramblers and families and is a safe haven for the purpose and provides opportunity for social interaction. There is also a variety of wildlife on or visiting the site including Rabbits, Foxes, Squirrels, Snakes, a variety of Birds, Bats and occasional Deer. Loss of this space to either Housing or Traveller sites will deprive the community of this sanctuary.

The current Green Belt site contributes to the environmental ambience of the area and encourages people of all ages into activity (walking etc) and enjoyment of nature. There is a social element as well in that walkers will often meet in a countryside setting and have a chat.

There is a basic conflict between the numerous site allocation proposals in Send, lovelace, and (Old Woking) as village locations and the need and ability to provide infrastructure improvements. Take into account the ludicrous proposals for Wisley and Gosden Farm as well and you have a recipe for urban sprawl and gridlock. A large proportion of rural village residents have to rely on the car for commuting and essentials hopping trips as bus/train services are infrequent and are too far away. Mass development on this scale in a rural greenbelt village is a recipe for disaster, wholly inappropriate and should be resisted.

Send Hill is narrow and does not allow two cars to pass in several places including outside our house directly opposite the proposed site. There are no pavements along most of the road meaning people including children, OAP's, dog walkers and ramblers walk in the road. In addition there are six footpaths emerging onto Send Hill. Any new development that increases the car population will have an adverse safety implication. If this and the other site allocations in Send, Old Woking and lovelace are allowed, significant increase in traffic flows and queues will occur along Broadmead, Send Road and Send Barns lane (A247). As a consequence of this, motorists will seek to use alternative routes including Potterslane and Send Hill which are entirely unsuitable for the purpose. In addition to the safety implications to the local residents, cyclists and Horse Riders who use Send Hill there is considerable danger for the children at the School end of the road at drop off and pick up times.

Send Hill is mentioned in the Surrey Cycle Guide No 2. Walkers (children, OAP's, dog walkers, joggers and ramblers) use the road as there are no pavements in most of the length of Send Hill. Any new development that increases the traffic flow will have safety and environmental implications.

No amount of architectural creativeness or spin could create an attractive new view with the proposed developments.

The narrowness of most of Send Hill is clearly evident and developments such as this can only cause visual deterioration and increased safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Traveller Pitches and 40 Houses - I object to this policy and comment on the amendment only in this instance as requested (my previous comments from the 2016 consultation still apply).

Re Requirements item 10) Improved visibility to be provided at the junction of Send Hill with Potters Lane:- While any improvement to the visibility at this junction would be welcome as a basic safety issue (it's a blind bend turning right out of Send Hill), the fact remains that Send Hill is single track for the most part including past the proposed site and this house and is fundamentally unsuitable for increased traffic flow (see photographs attached). It becomes single track within approximately 25 metres of this junction along Send Hill (although centre white lines are marked for about 50 metres).

Air Ambulance on the Policy A44 site for a Medical emergency in Send Hill on 22nd February 2014.

Policy A44 Land West
Traveller Pitches and 40 Houses - I object to this policy and comment on the amendments only in this particular instance as requested (my previous comments from the 2016 consultation still apply).

Re Key Considerations item 1) Contamination:
The potentially hazardous materials buried at this site render it unsuitable for traveller pitches or housing development. Along with my previous comments in July 2016 this site should remain Green Belt and be entirely removed from the proposed local plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: [LP2017_Scanned_B_H_Holmes_Redacted.pdf (7.9 MB)]
Comment ID: PSLPS16/20  Respondent: 10774817 / Jack Aboe  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to this proposal.

The two roads that would access this site, namely Send Hill and Potters Lane are not suitable for increased traffic.

With the other proposed development (A43) The Schools nor the local services would be able to cope.

Send is a village not a suburb of Guildford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2396  Respondent: 10775137 / Wendy Lodge  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Regarding Policy A44, I object to the plan to develop land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill. Again, this is a new site and has such was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been properly consulted upon previously.

I object to this development of protected Green Belt Land and the impact it would have on our wildlife, including the habitat of some listed birds in the area. This development would have a serious impact on the landscape of Send Hill and Potters Lane.

I object to the plan for two Traveller Pitches on this site. There is no need for any further Pitches in the Borough. The land on this site is old landfill with documented hazardous waste. Government guidance to planners was that Green Belt should only be built on if there are exceptional circumstances requiring this to happen. There are no exceptional circumstances at Send Hill. [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it]

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3499  Respondent: 10784769 / Jane Baker  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to policy A44 which would see 40 homes and two travellers’ pitches on land west of 4 Winds Ridge and Send Hill. This was again a NEW site NOT included in 18 draft and therefore has NOT been consulted on previously. Once
again this is Green Belt land partly containing unsafe landfill. Access is by a narrow lane which could never take the volume of traffic that would ensue from travellers' pitches.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7231</th>
<th>Respondent: 10784769 / Jane Baker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to policy A44 which would see 40 homes and two travellers' pitches on land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill. This was again a NEW site NOT included in 18 draft and therefore has NOT been consulted on previously. Once again this is Green Belt land partly containing unsafe landfill. Access is by a narrow lane which could never take the volume of traffic that would ensue from travellers' pitches.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4219</th>
<th>Respondent: 10789601 / Jennifer Hodgetts</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill being designated for 40 homes and 2 pitches for travellers. This also is a new plan not included in regulation 18 draft. Not consulted upon previously. Not suitable for development due to Green Belt status. The existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste.

The narrow single track country road does not provide sufficient access to the proposed site. This makes the whole proposal inappropriate.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1607</th>
<th>Respondent: 10793281 / Paul Woodington</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to policy A44 which would see 40 homes and two travellers' pitches on land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill. This was again a NEW site NOT included in 18 draft and therefore has NOT been consulted on previously. Once again this is Green Belt land partly containing unsafe landfill. Access is by a narrow lane which could never take the volume of traffic that would ensue from traveller's pitches.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2253</th>
<th>Respondent: 10793697 / Norman Carpenter</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to this development as it again relies on entry and exit on the SEND HILL an extremely dangerous single lane at this point and the steep hill runs down to effectively a 5 way junction with Potters lane, Church lane and Vicarage- it is renowned for its accidents albeit most have been minor to serious at this date.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1278</th>
<th>Respondent: 10793697 / Norman Carpenter</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My objection to this development has further strengthened since last year, having seen several potential accidents occur at 5 way junction as well as not being able to drive up Send Hill on many occasions due to traffic blockage on the NARROW RD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3308</th>
<th>Respondent: 10798369 / Gail Hollis</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and two travellers' sites on land opposite Winds Ridge on Send Hill. It is an inappropriate development because the road is a single width country road providing insufficient access. The site was previously land- fill and contains documented unsafe landfill waste registered with Guildford Borough Council. Any development will spoil a high amenity area set in beautiful countryside.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7939</th>
<th>Respondent: 10799425 / Guildford Greenbelt Group (Susan Parker)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We object to policy A44 Send Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints. The proposed development is not sustainable because of poor infrastructure. Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site for travellers or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring. The site is a high quality green belt amenity area within beautiful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
surrounding countryside and would be spoilt by the development. A Wasteland Solutions environmental report on Send Hill dated March 2004 gave evidence of past ponding of water in the excavated area. Further development would disturb the water table and increase risk of flooding to surrounding properties. The site was used as a GBC registered landfill site and shown on the 1963-8 Ordnance Survey maps as “refuse and slag heap”. It is therefore unsuitable for such a development on health reasons. On the 1971 Ordnance Survey the site is shown as a “refuse tip” prior to when proper licensing/registration was required.

The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. We therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials. GBC has installed gas monitoring wells on site since July 2000. One well recording methane gas discharge. A Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005 identifies the proposed site as GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/11/LLC with type of waste not identified. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations.

We therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials. A Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005 identifies the proposed site GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/12 with type of waste identified as “unrestricted”.

This causes concern as to what it does contain and the dangers if disturbed. An Envirosearch Report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004 and historical map data and information from GBC has identified the site as landfill and has “areas of potentially contaminative industrial activities” and “potential risk from landfill gas migrations”. Development of this site would be a health hazard.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/26  Respondent: 10799489 / Shai Sinai  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Finally we also object to policy A44 West Ridge and Send Hill. Again this site is new, not included in the regulation 18 draft and not previously consulted on. This is high quality Green Belt land. The subsoil of the site contains documented landfill waste and is vented, making it totally unsuitable for development. Access is completely insufficient. Please reject these proposals they are unwanted, unnecessary and have zero local support.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1273  Respondent: 10803009 / M Robson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A44 - the building of houses on land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1275  Respondent: 10803009 / M Robson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4179</th>
<th>Respondent: 10805889 / Bernard Corrigan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to Policy A44 1.9 ha land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill was not included in regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted on appropriately.

I object to the GBC local plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2052</th>
<th>Respondent: 10806465 / Moya Miller</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To the proposal to develop 40 houses & 2 traveller's sites at Send Hill. Send Hill is an affluent area, completely unsuitable for travellers pitches with the various transport they employ [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature]

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6308</th>
<th>Respondent: 10807969 / Sarra Martin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would like to register my objection to the new set of plans for Guildford and the surrounding area.

As a dog walker, runner and horse rider, I am very unhappy about the change to the green belt. Why are we losing this valuable resource in which people can walk and exercise? Wellbeing and quality of life is hugely affected by the availability of green space and I feel abandoning it goes completely in the face of any Government drive to improve wellbeing and mental health - I think there was a very clear promise to maintain areas of the green belt. Building developments at Send Hill would impact on ancient woodland and nature again would be destroyed.
As a regular commuter and road user, I am also well aware of the pressures on the roads and A3. Send is already a funnel and pressure point and the increased traffic due to the extra houses seems to me to be a step too far. Many of the roads are single width and under pressure already. A new interchange would increase traffic in the whole area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6309</th>
<th>Respondent: 10807969 / Sarra Martin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the development at Send Hill, where an area of ancient and natural beauty would be destroyed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6460</th>
<th>Respondent: 10813345 / Ruth Cope</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to policy A44 which would see 40 homes and two travellers' pitches on land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill. This was again a NEW site NOT included in 18 draft and therefore has NOT been consulted on previously. Once again this is Green Belt land partly containing unsafe landfill. Access is by a narrow lane which could never take the volume of traffic that would ensue from traveller's pitches. It is an inappropriate location because the narrow width single access country road provides insufficient access. The subsoil of the proposed site contains documented unsafe landfill waste registered at GBC. Any development there would spoil a high amenity area set in beautiful countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/371</th>
<th>Respondent: 10815681 / Penelope Corlett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Policy A44. I object to the proposed development on the land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill. This site is Green Belt and is also unsuitable because the subsoil is unsafe as it is an old land fill site and is currently vented because of noxious gases. It is also unsuitable because of the narrow lane and very dangerous blind corner with the junction of Potters Lane and quite unsuitable for Travellers Pitches with their big lorries and caravans. The additional traffic generated would be impossible on an already narrow road which gets very congested with school traffic and parking.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/2707 | Respondent: 10817633 / M Mansbridge | Agent: |
1. I OBJECT to the building of 40 houses and 2 traveller's pitches at Send Hill because of the very narrow road and the site contamination with unsafe landfill.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5299  Respondent: 10819041 / Lesley Stedman  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I firmly reject the Local Plan, detailed above for the following reasons.

This is green belt land and I suggest you concentrate on re-using brown field sites in the area, such as the whole of the Wisley airfield site.

The road of Send Hill is far too narrow and is congested to the point of being impassable during school morning and afternoon traffic periods and is already a "no go" area to the existing residents during those times.

Why does the Council persist in these anti-social lines of thought when obvious brown field sites should be used more readily and legally, without affecting the existing long suffering public.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7564  Respondent: 10817633 / M Mansbridge  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the building of 40 houses and 2 traveller's pitches at Send Hill because of the very narrow road and the site contamination with unsafe landfill.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3249  Respondent: 10819041 / Lesley Stedman  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the site is not large enough for the proposed use.
• I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that it would cause adverse impact on street parking.
I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that Send is in green belt. The proposed inset is inappropriate due to its permanent green belt status.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that Send Hill is a narrow road result in loss of a turning point for vehicles.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that it would impact the nature reserve nearby. The proposed site is a quality green belt amenity area within countryside and would be spoilt by development.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the existing road and parking infrastructure is already inadequate or under pressure and could worsen with the planned development, reducing quality of life.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that too many houses are proposed to Send/ Send Marsh are and the impact on traffic congestion and local services would be unacceptable.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the proposed number of houses potentially could result in 92 extra cars in Send Hill which is already suffering from congestion particularly at school run time.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that this would cause loss of village identity, be detrimental to the community and increased flood risk.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that a Wasteland Solutions environmental report on Send Hill dated March 2004 gave evidence of past ponding of water in the excavated area. Further development would disturb water table and increase risk of flooding to my property.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the proposed development site (A44) was used as GBC registered landfill site, not a quarry as listed as reference LLA 2081 in the local plan.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the 1963-8 Ordnance Survey maps of proposed site mark it as “refuse and slag heap”. It is therefore unsuitable for such a development on health reasons.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3528  Respondent: 10819329 / D Smith  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO the proposed development on land adjacent to Winds Ridge and Send hill. This is GREEN BELT land and was not part of the 2014 consultation.

The proposal is for 40 homes and includes 2 Travellers pitches on land known to be contaminated and is currently vented. Access to the site is a narrow single lane country road from Vicarage Lane or from Send. The crossroads at Send Road and Send Hill is very busy at times due to parents taking their children to and from St Bedes School.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1090  Respondent: 10820961 / D Davies  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A44. Although you may say this is a small development the added traffic would add to the gridlock situation which would arise from all these developments. Also the subsoil on this site contains landfill waste and is currently vented and not suitable for building.

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5932  Respondent: 10828801 / Kathryn Fox  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 traveller pitches at Send Hill, it is an inappropriate location and both I and the residents in Send do not welcome this

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3089  Respondent: 10828961 / Carey Lodge  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

5. Policy A44. I object to the plan to develop land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill. Again, this is a new site and has such was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been properly consulted upon previously.

I object to this development of protected GreenBelt land. Last year (2015) three pairs of Lapwings attempted nesting on land adjacent to this site. These are Red listed birds. This development would have a serious impact on the landscape of Send Hill and Potters Lane.

I object to the plan for two Traveller Pitches on this site. There is no need for any further Pitches in the Borough. The land on this site is old landfill with documented hazardous waste. Government guidance to planners was that Green Belt should only be built on if there are exceptional circumstances requiring this to happen. There are no exceptional circumstances at Send Hill.

I strongly object to the cynical manner in which GBC has added unnecessary housing and industrial proposals to our Local Plan. I cannot believe that it is legal for the development of a large road junction with huge impact to the surrounding area to be shoe horned into this plan without proper consultation. I object to GBC ignoring Government advice that GreenBelt land must remain protected except in exceptional need, which does not existing this local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1758  Respondent: 10829281 / Kevin Nicholls  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill. This is an inappropriate location because of restricted access caused by narrow width country roads. The subsoil of the proposed site contains documented unsafe landfill waste registered at GBC. Any development there would spoil a high amenity area set in beautiful countryside. This site is also new, was not included in Reg 18 of the draft plan and has not been consulted on previously.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2933  Respondent: 10830753 / AJ Cheeseman  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill.

The site of the travellers' pitches seems to have changed since the original Local Plan. The 40 houses were also not in the original Local Plan. I understand that the site is documented as unsafe landfill waste. Development would again be on Green Belt land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2755  Respondent: 10830785 / PE Whatley  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal A43 and A44 to include traveller pitches anywhere in the immediate area because there is absolutely no proven need for these. However, to disproportionately allot such sites in Guildford Borough as a whole on the area around Send is not acceptable as there should be a more even distribution over the entire Borough. How come Wisley and Gosden Hill are only allocated 8 each for their proposed developments of over 1500 homes, whilst Send gets 10?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1181  Respondent: 10831585 / Richard Stedman  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the site is not large enough for the proposed use.
- I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that it would cause adverse impact on street parking.
- I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.
- I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that Send is in green belt. The proposed inset is inappropriate due to its permanent green belt status.
• I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that Send Hill is a narrow road result in loss of a turning point for vehicles.
• I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that it would impact the nature reserve nearby. The proposed site is a quality green belt amenity area within countryside and would be spoilt by development.
• I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the existing road and parking infrastructure is already inadequate or under pressure and could worsen with the planned development, reducing quality of life.
• I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that too many houses are proposed to Send/ Send Marsh are and the impact on traffic congestion and local services would be unacceptable.
• I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the proposed number of houses potentially could result in 92 extra cars in Send Hill which is already suffering from congestion particularly at school run time.
• I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that this would cause loss of village identity, be detrimental to the community and increased flood risk.
• I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the proposed development site (A44) was used as GBC registered landfill site, not a quarry as listed as reference LLA 2081 in the local plan.
• I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the 1963-8 Ordnance Survey maps of proposed site mark it as “refuse and slag heap”. It is therefore unsuitable for such a development on health reasons.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4442 Respondent: 10832673 / Lisa Hall Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am currently away but my husband has this morning informed me that there potential plans to try and build 40 houses on Send hill plus a travellers site. It's absolutely ludicrous! Send hill is such a busy road what with the school being just off of there and the traffic twice a day is just madness. You can't get thro there for love nor money. The end of send hill leading into potters lane is highly annoying because only one car fits down there and you have to permanently reverse as 90 percent of the time you come across a car coming the other way. It is a dangerous road and you have to go incredibly slow as there are blind spots. That then brings me to the actual junction of send hill and potters lane. It is the most dangerous dangerous spot. I have had a near miss pulling out of there. You always have to stop and put your window down and listen for traffic before pulling out as its a complete blind spot. My sister in law was coming along potters lane minding her own business in her car when an older man pulled out of send hill in front of her and she couldn't brake in time and smashed straight into the side of his car with my niece who was about 5 months old. It was absolutely horrendous and could have been horrific. She wrote her car off in the process. The crash was so loud that the people who own send farm heard it and ran out to help. But that crossroad needs a massive massive mirror there so that people can see. My worry is that teenagers cycle to george abbot from our road and you can't hear a bike coming along. Anyhow so how you propose building more houses and creating more traffic up there is beyond me.

With regards to travellers sites in Send we just don't need it. What send needs is a revamp to elevate the area like its surrounding areas such as ripley and west Clandon. The last thing send needs are traveller sites. The village shops area needs a total revamp and the village could do with some money injected into it to make it more appealing, [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it]. Unfortunately I'm not quite sure how else to phrase all of this without getting to the point. But we are surrounded by lovely villages and Send does need some tlc to try and bring it up a bit. Please see my other email with regards to my views on the ridiculous idea about building a further 400 plus houses. We do not have the facilities to maintain any of that nor the capacity to take more cars, more patients at the practice, the school is absolutely dreadful at the moment, so much so we are paying to go private which is infuriating that we have to do that because the school is in special measures!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A44 Send Hill.

There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

The proposed development is not sustainable because of poor infrastructure. Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site for travellers or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.

The site is a high quality green belt amenity area within beautiful surrounding countryside and would be spoiled by the development.

A Wasteland Solutions environmental report on Send Hill dated March 2004 gave evidence of past ponding of water in the excavated area. Further development would disturb the water table and increase risk of flooding to surrounding properties.

The site was used as a GBC registered landfill site and shown on the 1963-8 Ordnance Survey maps as “refuse and slag heap”. It is therefore unsuitable for such a development on health reasons.

On the 1971 Ordnance Survey the site is shown as a “refuse tip” prior to when proper licensing/registration was required. The date of the landfill works predate the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. I therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials.

GBC has installed gas monitoring wells on site since July 2000. One well recording methane gas discharge.

A Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005-Identifies the proposed site as GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/11/LLC with type of waste not identified. The date of the landfill works predate the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. I therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials.

A Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005-Identifies proposed site GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/12 with type of waste identified as “unrestricted”. This causes concern as to what it does contain and the dangers if disturbed.

An Envirosearch Report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004 and historical map data and information from GBC has identified the site as landfill and has “areas of potentially contaminative industrial activities” and “potential risk from landfill gas migrations”. Development of this site would be a health hazard.

I feel contempt for Councillors of G.B.C. who are attempting to force developments that destroy Green Belt land in a cynical move and return the number of houses to far in excess of what is required. There is no need for any more housing on top of the 13,860 already proposed for the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to policy A44 Send Hill.

There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

The proposed development is not sustainable because of poor infrastructure. Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site for travellers or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.

The site is a high quality green belt amenity area within beautiful surrounding countryside and would be spoilt by the development.

A Wasteland Solutions environmental report on Send Hill dated March 2004 gave evidence of past ponding of water in the excavated area. Further development would disturb the water table and increase risk of flooding to surrounding properties.

The site was used as a GBC registered landfill site and shown on the 1963-8 Ordnance Survey maps as “refuse and slag heap”. It is therefore unsuitable for such a development on health reasons.

On the 1971 Ordnance Survey the site is shown as a “refuse tip” prior to when proper licensing/registration was required. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. I therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials.

GBC has installed gas monitoring wells on site since July 2000. One well recording methane gas discharge.

A Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005-Identifies the proposed site as GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/11/LLC with type of waste not identified. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. I therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials.

A Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005-Identifies proposed site GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/12 with type of waste identified as “unrestricted”. This causes concern as to what it does contain and the dangers if disturbed.

An Envirosearch Report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004 and historical map data and information from GBC has identified the site as landfill and has “areas of potentially contaminative industrial activities” and “potential risk from landfill gas migrations”. Development of this site would be a health hazard.

I feel contempt for Councillors of G.B.C. who are attempting to force developments that destroy Green Belt land in a cynical move and return the number of houses to far in excess of what is required. There is no need for any more housing on top of the 13,860 already proposed for the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2226</th>
<th>Respondent: 10836097 / B.V. Dabbs</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document</strong>: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT TO POLICY A44. 1 SITE WEST OF WINDS RIDGE &amp; SEND HILL TO BUILD 40 HOUSES &amp; 2 TRAVELLERS PITCHES ON SITE CONTAINING DOCUMENTED UNSAFE LANDFILL WASTE &amp; WITH INEFFICIENT ACCESS FROM SINGLE TRACK ROAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1102</th>
<th>Respondent: 10836161 / Philip Bennett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document</strong>: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further, the specific proposal for a traveller's pitch has also not been consulted on previously and in addition the roads that will be needed to access this site together with the proposed sites for development at Winds Ridge and Send Hill, designated for 40 homes and 2 travellers pitches, are narrow, hedge lined lanes that are not suitable to accommodate the size of road required to manage the additional traffic that will pass along their route.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust that you will reconsider the totally inappropriate plans which are objected to by the residents of Send.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3383</th>
<th>Respondent: 10837313 / Mary Jane Gray</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document</strong>: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the site proposed under Policy 44. This is another new site that was not included in the Regulation 18 draft document. As well as being Green Belt land this site has been the subject of extensive landfill activities that need to be fully researched before it can even be considered for development. I believe that the inclusion of 2No. Travellers Pitches at this site is wholly inappropriate for both the travellers and the existing community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4121</th>
<th>Respondent: 10837665 / J.H. Lakeman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document</strong>: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I also object to Policy A44, which again was not included in the regulation 18 draft and is within permanent Green Belt status plus it contains unsafe landfill waste and further is only accessed by a narrow single track country road and it is close to a cemetery where a quiet and peaceful environment is preferable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/120  Respondent: 10839009 / Jacky Fenton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly OBJECT to the 40 homes and 2 Travellers Pitches designated to the land West of Winds Ridge on Send Hill. Again this site was not included in the regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously. This area is within beautiful countryside in the Green Belt which would be spoilt by your development. The area is also a known landfill site with documented unsafe waste which is currently vented. Disturbing this land could leach toxic chemicals into the surrounding atmosphere. The cemetery is opposite your proposed site which is meant to be a peaceful place for people to come and visit their lost ones. Adding another 40 homes with two cars per household will remove the peace and quiet. This proposal is in inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road which becomes very hazardous in winter, providing insufficient access to the site.

I hope you take my objections into account when making your final decisions.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2502  Respondent: 10839073 / Annie Hutchison  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed development west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill. This new site was not included in the original plan and has not been consulted on. Apart from the loss of Green Belt this would entail, I understand the area includes vented landfill, increasing the risk of building on the site. In addition, the site is served by a narrow single track road, which could not safely handle the increase in traffic which the development would produce.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3410  Respondent: 10839649 / Lawrence Harris  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the site proposed under Policy 44. This is another new site that was not included in the Regulation 18 draft document. As well as being Green Belt land this site has been the subject of extensive landfill activities thus afall
Environmental Study is required before it can even be considered for development. In any event, I believe that the inclusion of 2 No. Travellers Pitches at this site is wholly inappropriate for both the travellers and the existing community given its proximity to the new housing proposals and other residential developments in the immediate vicinity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attended documents:
6) I OBJECT to policy A44 which would see 40 homes and two travellers' pitches on land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill. This was again a NEW site NOT included in 18 draft and therefore has NOT been consulted on previously. Once again this is Green Belt land partly containing unsafe landfill. Access is by a narrow lane which could never take the volume of traffic that would ensue from traveller's pitches.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2687  Respondent: 10843585 / Jackie Payne  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the development of 40 houses at the top of Send Hill in Send. Again this is a narrow road at the top of Send Hill and is narrow width single access country lane. This development would spoil a very attractive road set in lovely countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7552  Respondent: 10843585 / Jackie Payne  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of 40 houses at the top of Send Hill in Send. Again this is a narrow road at the top of Send Hill and is narrow width single access country lane. This development would spoil a very attractive road set in lovely countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7666  Respondent: 10844993 / Simon Wright  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A44 Send Hill.

There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

The proposed development is not sustainable because of poor infrastructure. Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site for travellers or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.
The site is a high quality green belt amenity area within beautiful surrounding countryside and would be spoilt by the development.

A Wasteland Solutions environmental report on Send Hill dated March 2004 gave evidence of past ponding of water in the excavated area. Further development would disturb the water table and increase risk of flooding to surrounding properties.

The site was used as a GBC registered landfill site and shown on the 1963-8 Ordnance Survey maps as “refuse and slag heap”. It is therefore unsuitable for such a development on health reasons.

On the 1971 Ordnance Survey the site is shown as a “refuse tip” prior to when proper licensing/registration was required. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. I therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials.

GBC has installed gas monitoring wells on site since July 2000. One well recording methane gas discharge.

A Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005 Identifies proposed site GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/11/LLC with type of waste not identified. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. I therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials.

A Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005 Identifies proposed site GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/12 with type of waste identified as “unrestricted”. This causes concern as to what it does contain and the dangers if disturbed.

An Envirosearch Report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004 and historical map data and information from GBC has identified the site as landfill and has “areas of potentially contaminative industrial activities” and “potential risk from landfill gas migrations”. Development of this site would be a health hazard.

I feel contempt for Councillors of G.B.C. who are attempting to force developments that destroy Green Belt land in a cynical move and return the number of houses to far in excess of what is required. There is no need for any more housing on top of the 13,860 already proposed for the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>10846145 / Phillipa Bottomley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy A44. 1.9 ha Land West Ridge and Send Hill.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This area used to be a land fill waste site and there are currently vents in place which may be a concern for those that live in houses built on this site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send Hill is a very narrow road especially where it meets Potters Lane, where it is single lane, it then comes out onto a blind corner. Even an increase of 40 houses and 2 travellers sites would cause untold problems and danger.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I live on Potters Lane which since Sat nav has changed radically We continue to get double-decker lorries and large trucks bombing along on a totally unsuitable road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 extra houses in Send Hill and 2 travellers site would only increase this even more.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has research been carried out on the nearby roads?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How can GBC add these new developments so late in the day?

Whilst I understand that new houses do need to be built I object to both developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6774</th>
<th>Respondent: 10846625 / Frank Drennan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 I object to policy A44 “Send Hill” on the grounds that;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 The proposed development is not sustainable because of poor infrastructure. Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site for travellers or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 The site is a high quality green belt amenity area within beautiful surrounding countryside and would be spoilt by the development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 A Wasteland Solutions environmental report on Send Hill dated March 2004 gave evidence of past ponding of water in the excavated area. Further development would disturb the water table and increase risk of flooding to surrounding properties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 The site was used as a GBC registered landfill site and shown on the 1963-8 Ordnance Survey maps as “refuse and slag heap”. It is therefore unsuitable for such a development on health reasons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 On the 1971 Ordnance Survey the site is shown as a “refuse tip” prior to when proper licensing/registration was required. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. I therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 GBC has installed gas monitoring wells on site since July 2000. One well recording methane gas discharge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9 A Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005-Identifies the proposed site as GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/11/LLC with type of waste not identified. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. I therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10 A Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005-Identifies proposed site GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/12 with type of waste identified as “unrestricted”. This causes concern as to what it does contain and the dangers if disturbed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11 An Envirosearch Report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004 and historical map data and information from GBC has identified the site as landfill and has “areas of potentially contaminative industrial activities” and “potential risk from landfill gas migrations”. Development of this site would be a health hazard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6441</th>
<th>Respondent: 10848577 / Jen Dunbar</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill. There is a narrow country road providing access to the site which would become very congested. The subsoil of the proposed site contains documented unsafe landfill waste registered at Guildford Borough Council. Development there would destroy a high amenity area set in beautiful countryside. It would also disrupt or destroy habitats for local wildlife.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
As I'm sure you are also aware Send cemetery sits very near the proposed travellers site as well as the new housing site, which is currently a peaceful, quiet location for people to visit their deceased relatives, that tranquility would also be lost.

Lastly the proposed housing site is one of the few open spaces for local people to be able to walk either with their dogs or children enjoying nature. The open space was recently used by the air ambulance to airlift a local neighbour, that would also be lost.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Whilst School Places do not affect me personally and others are probably more qualified to speak on the subject. As I understand it many did not get their children in to their first choice of St Bede’s, these developments will just make it harder which will mean more traffic on the roads for school runs.

What does affect me is the inability to get a doctors appointment in a reasonable time at the Villages Medical Centre – these developments will add to that pressure, without I would imagine more resources being made available

So in summary I do strongly object to the proposed unreasonable level of development crammed into such a small area and I hope the review process sees the common sense in keeping the developments to a sensible scale for the area

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3983  Respondent: 10853857 / Norman Kidd  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Policy A44 1.9 ha LAND WEST OF WINDS RIDGE AND SEND HILL designated for 40 homes and 2 Travellers Pitches. This site is NEW and was NOT included in the regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted upon previously. Development for housing is inappropriate due to its permanent Green Belt status and high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt by any development. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site. I object to the proposals on this site mainly because it is a please country lane but by definition narrow ! The addition of unsuitable traffic, coupled with the inherent danger already existing at the Potters Lane end of the Send Hill make the proposals completely ridiculous

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3552  Respondent: 10855713 / Janet Holland  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the policy A44. 1.9 HA Land West of Winds Ridge and Send Hill. This has been designated for 40 homes and 2 traveller's pitches.

Where has this come from? It was NOT included in the regulation 18 draft and has NOT been previously consulted on. This is an area of unspoilt natural beauty and should not be destroyed. The subsoil is documented as containing unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented, thereby making it unsuitable for development. Anyone visiting the village will be aware of the enormous volume of traffic it experiences daily especially during morning and evening rush hours and school drop off and collection times. The junction at the bottom of Send Hill already struggles to cope. Adding yet more houses and traveller pitches (with caravans) will make this junction impossible to cope and dangerous. Send Hill is a arrow width single track country road and certainly not built for so much extra daily traffic. Surely common sense dictates this is not a sensible idea.

Thank you for taking the time to read my concerns. Please do not allow Guildford Borough Council to 'sacrifice' the village status of Send with its beautiful surrounding countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
POLICY A44 LAND WEST OF WINDS RIDGE AND SEND HILL designated for 40 homes and 2 Travellers Pitches.

I object to this site as it is NEW and was NOT included in the regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted upon previously. Development for housing is inappropriate due to its permanent Green Belt status and high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt by any development. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site. I object to the proposals on this site mainly because it is a please country lane but by definition narrow! The addition of unsuitable traffic, coupled with the inherent danger already existing at the Potters Lane end of the Send Hill make the proposals completely ridiculous. Whilst School Places do not affect me personally and others are probably more qualified to speak on the subject, as I understand it many parents did not get their children in to their first choice of St Bede’s, these proposed developments will just make it harder which will mean more traffic on the roads for school runs.

What does affect me is the inability to get a doctor’s appointment in a reasonable time at the Villages Medical Centre now – these developments will add to that pressure, without I would imagine more resources being made available.

So in summary, I object to the proposed unreasonable level of development crammed into such a small area and I hope the review process sees the common sense in keeping the developments to a sensible scale for the area

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the proposal in the local plan for the following reasons:

- The site is not large enough for the proposed use
- Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.
- Send Hill is in the green belt, so the proposed inset is inappropriate due to its permanent green belt
- The existing road and parking is already inadequate and under pressure and would worsen with the planning development and the additional cars this would incur, its particularly bad at the school run.
- The proposed plan could increase flood risk as a report March 2004 gave evidence of past ponding in the excavated area and further development would disturb the water table.
- I believe there is a danger that any disturbance would be a health hazard due to unknown materials having been placed in this landfill site
- Southern County Searchers report Jan 2005 identifies the site as potentially contaminated industrial land with usage of unknown constituents. Changes to the site could cause potential ground water vulnerability to my property.
- Travellers accommodation assessment research purported to have been taken June/July 2012 by hill field services cannot be so. This market research company was dissolved in Jan 2011
- Guildford BC has recorded methane gas discharge since 200

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/8266  Respondent: 10858977 / Angela Otterson  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A44 Send Hill

There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

The proposed development is not sustainable because of poor infrastructure. Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site for travellers or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.

The site is a high quality green belt amenity area within beautiful surrounding countryside and would be spoilt by the development.

A Wasteland Solutions environmental report on Send Hill dated March 2004 gave evidence of past ponding of water in the excavated area. Further development would disturb the water table and increase risk of flooding to surrounding properties.

The site was used as a GBC registered landfill site and shown on the 1963-8 Ordnance Survey maps as “refuse and slag heap”. It is therefore unsuitable for such a development on health reasons.

On the 1971 Ordnance Survey the site is shown as a “refuse tip” prior to when proper licensing/registration was required. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. I therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials.

GBC has installed gas monitoring wells on site since July 2000. One well recording methane gas discharge.

A Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005-Identifies the proposed site as GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/11/LLC with type of waste not identified. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. I therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials. A Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005-Identifies proposed site GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/12 with type of waste identified as “unrestricted”. This causes concern as to what it does contain and the dangers if disturbed.

An Envirosearch Report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004 and historical map data and information from GBC has identified the site as landfill and has “areas of potentially contaminative industrial activities” and “potential risk from landfill gas migrations”. Development of this site would be a health hazard.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1569  Respondent: 10859265 / Neil Haxton  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

6) I OBJECT to policy A44 which would see 40 homes and two travellers' pitches on land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill. This was again a NEW site NOT included in 18 draft and therefore has NOT been consulted on previously. Once
again this is Green Belt land partly containing unsafe landfill. Access is by a narrow lane which could never take the volume of traffic that would ensue from traveller’s pitches.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4484  Respondent: 10859489 / Jennifer Procter  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Send Hill

The proposal for 40 new homes at Send Hill and 2 travellers pitches

I object to this development because there is no requirement for these houses.

I object to the fact that this proposed development is in the Greenbelt in an area of beautiful countryside and there are no special circumstances which would make it necessary or desirable

I object to this proposed development on the grounds that subsoil on the site contains unsafe landfill waste. There is documented evidence to this effect and the site is currently vented with detectable methane emissions. Elderly residents who had close contact with the site report consequent health problems.

I object to the inclusion of 2 travellers pitches. The road is narrow and manoeuvring and achieving access for the large vehicles used by travellers would be impossible.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6398  Respondent: 10859873 / Mat Clark  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to houses and travellers pitch at Send Hill. Insufficient access and destruction of countryside. Unsafe landfill waste not considered.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1380  Respondent: 10860129 / M Hebberd  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Sendhill Development, the road is not wide enough for cars also cemetary parking. We are Green Belt also. Send Road, Send marsh are congested now extra cars will be mayhem. As for the travellers site, nothing will be safe. I have lived in send for 54 years. It will no longer be a village.
**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6620  **Respondent:** 10864065 / Alec Mcindoe  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill because of the restricted access to the site and the consequential increase in traffic and dangers for pedestrians locally. I also understand that the subsoil of the proposed site contains documented unsafe landfill waste.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2195  **Respondent:** 10865889 / Dreda M Todd DBO  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. **I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and two travellers, pitches at Send Hill,** because I am concerned that the subsoil on that site contains documented unsafe landfill waste registered at GBC. This site (A44) was originally a sand pit not a quarry and was subsequently marked on Ordinance Survey map 1971 as a "refuse tip". I therefore fear that any disturbance would be a health hazard due to unknown infill materials and would also endanger the nearby nature reserve. There is also an identified risk of flooding to local properties of which mine is one.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/85  **Respondent:** 10866785 / Laurie Mckeague  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the building of houses on what was a landfill site .
I object because I paid high price for my property to have an open aspect overlooking green belt land.
I object because it will devalue my property
I object to having traveller pitches in a well established good residential area.
I object because of increased traffic on a narrow road with no footpaths and limited lighting.
I object because of the increased population where the gp surgery and local schools are already stretched to the limit.
I object because I feel that the Un - necessary use of green belt land where there are brown sites that should be used.
I object because this site is new and was not included in the regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1898</th>
<th>Respondent: 10866945 / Kristine Good</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to 40 houses /2 traveller sites at SEND HILL, again because it is a narrow single width road and not suitable for additional traffic. Also because the site has previously been used for land fill making it unsuitable for residential use. In addition a large development here would not be in keeping with its surroundings, currently open countryside.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6418</th>
<th>Respondent: 10867009 / Paul Good</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to 40 houses /2 traveller sites at SEND HILL, again because it is a narrow single width road and not suitable for additional traffic. Also because the site has previously been used for land fill making it unsuitable for residential use. In addition a large development here would not be in keeping with its surroundings, currently open countryside.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6283</th>
<th>Respondent: 10867105 / Steve Loosley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6477</th>
<th>Respondent: 10867137 / Richard Moore</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A44. 1.9ha Land West of Winds Ridge and Send Hill. This site designated for 40 homes and 2 traveller pitches is new and has not been consulted upon. Development for housing is inappropriate due to its Green Belt Status and the road is too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site proposed for the traveller pitches.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6471</td>
<td>Respondent: 10867329 / Anna Moore</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is <strong>Sound</strong>? ( ), is <strong>Legally Compliant</strong>? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A44. 1.9ha Land West of Winds Ridge and Send Hill. This site designated for 40 homes and 2 traveller pitches is new and has not been consulted upon. Development for housing is inappropriate due to its Green Belt Status and the road is too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site proposed for the traveller pitches.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/463</th>
<th>Respondent: 10868193 / Ron and Charmian Leach</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is <strong>Sound</strong>? ( ), is <strong>Legally Compliant</strong>? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to more houses and traveller's pitches on Send Hill. The Subsoul of the existing sites contain unsafe land fill. My husband actually worked on the original site when it was documented unsafe land.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/464</th>
<th>Respondent: 10868193 / Ron and Charmian Leach</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is <strong>Sound</strong>? ( ), is <strong>Legally Compliant</strong>? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to traveller's pitches on Send Hill. Travellers Pitches existed some years ago illegally. Their traffic caused many accidents and chaos in those days. I live close by and remember well how bad it was. The country road is very narrow. In conclusion I would urge Guildford Borough Council to please think again about needlessly destroying out beautiful countryside.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5766</th>
<th>Respondent: 10868609 / Robert Lockie</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is <strong>Sound</strong>? ( ), is <strong>Legally Compliant</strong>? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I object to site A44, land at Wind’s Ridge and Send Hill being used for 40 houses a 2 travellers’ pitches as it is an inappropriate location with narrow, single track country roads which will not have sufficient access and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
would spoil beautiful countryside. This is a new site and Not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been previously consulted on.

- I object to site A44, land at Wind’s Ridge and Send Hill being used for 40 houses and 2 travellers’ pitches as this land has unsafe landfill waste: this information is documented and registered with GBC.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/715  Respondent: 10868737 / P Molesworth  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to A44 the development of the area west of Send Hill Road which is not suitable to take increased traffic, it is not wide enough for two lanes of traffic as is evident by the lack of the middle white line. South of Send Hill is Potters lane which is already over used and is a frequent road with incidents where cars coming of the A3 cut through maintaining the speed they where traveling on the A3 and soon getting to the small number of houses and the blind corner where they meet an oncoming vehicle on a lane wide enough for a single car only. This is made worse in the winter months where the particular area is prone to flooding and the formation of ice frequently.

Further objection under A44 is that this is currently Green Belt and has an existing abundance of plant and wild life, this development will destroy this area with little or no regards to the eco system! The plan states “Green corridors and linkages to habitats outside of the site” where as in fact the plan removes the eco system habitats so hardly a linkage. The green belt beyond the site is predominantly farm land and not natural habitat.

I also object under A44 that requires “Sensitive design at site boundaries that has significant regard to the transition from village to greenfield” this only affects the boundary development whereas as the complete development will not be in keeping with the existing Village. As I personally have been rejected twice a conversion on my home for this very fact despite general support from the majority of my neighbours.

Under A44 there is a stated evidence of a quarry, but no mention that this was actually more recently used as a land fill, including the disposal of Asbestos! Therefore what precautions are taken into account for this? Development on a previous landfill should be considered very carefully. I understand that the area has been monitored recently and considered safe, however a major development would drastically affect this.

Also the area under A44 one of the few areas locally for dog walking with access both via Send Hill and a foot path to the village, developing this will remove one of the few remaining places people within send can let their dog roam free.

Finally I object to the large scale removal of green belt area which appears to be a back door approach to further development without considering the impacts specifically for the proposed development at the time.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8247  Respondent: 10869729 / Ralph Clark  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the proposals A42, A43 and A44 for a total of 485 homes and 2 travellers pitches in Send on the following grounds:

1. The increased housing will bring with it at least 1-2 cars per household which will add further traffic to the small village roads particularly at peak times. These roads already struggle to cope with current traffic levels.
2. Like much of Surrey the roads around Send are in a poor state and the increased traffic in the area will only add to their deterioration.
3. The increase in population of Send will impact on services such as the Villages Medical Centre where it is already difficult to arrange appointments with the Doctors.
4. There is no need whatsoever for industrial developments in Send as raised in A43. Send is not and never will be the right location for industrial premises being a rural village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1467  Respondent: 10869857 / A.C. Smith  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. **I object to Policy A44 (Land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill)** on a number of grounds:

(a) Send Hill is a narrow road, particularly at its southern end, with a lot of cars parked on it at various times of the day, and will be put under considerable strain by the traffic generated by the additional homes. In addition, it and the other small local roads, Vicarage lane, Potters Lane and Woodhill, are quite unsuited to large traveller caravans. The site is simply the wrong place for travellers’ pitches. A far more suitable site for travellers’ pitches, with easy access off the A3, is the triangle of land between the A3 and London Road, the B2215, which was included in the 2014 draft of the Local Plan for industrial development and has now been abandoned in favour of Garlick’s Arch.

(b) The development 40 houses on this site is excessive and disproportionate compared with the density of development in the surrounding area.

(c) The site’s history as landfill makes it unsuitable for residential development.

(d) No justification has been put forward for including travellers’ pitches in this site, and there is no logic for it. Elsewhere in the Draft Local Plan, where travellers’ pitches are included in sites designated for ordinary residential development, e.g. at Gosden Hill farm and Wisley Airfield, a guideline of 2 travellers’ pitches per 500 dwellings is adhered to. There is no rationale, in relation to Send Hill/Winds Ridge, for departing from that guideline and including 2 travellers’ pitches in a development of only 40 dwellings.

I am sending this letter by e-mail and post.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1944  Respondent: 10869921 / Kate Haskins  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

For similar reasons, I also object to the proposed development on Send Hill, a narrow, quiet lane already under strain during school pick up times. Increasing traffic volumes and adding further development will add yet more congestion to another quiet, peaceful residential area.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/3542</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>10869985 / Alan Blackburn</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Firstly I should like to state that I am appalled that after my objection over two years ago (one of 20,000). I should have to repeat the process. I consider the process now to be totally undemocratic and I now have no faith at all in local and national government.

All consideration: of Green Belt; infrastructure issues; insufficient school places; road access.

I live in Orchard Way and access is very difficult one might say almost impossible currently when schools are opening and closing.

The proposed development of houses and travellers site are ludicrous considering the narrowness of Send Hill. The loss of Green Belt is a disgrace especially when it was pledged to maintain it.

I took nearly ten minutes to get from Orchard Way to Send Surgery because of the school run and parked cars which are permanently there.

This would be much worse if the Send Hill developments go ahead.

The infrastructure; Schools, parking access, doctor's surgery and access for fire engines does not figure in the plan.

**Send Hill**

I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the site is not large enough for the proposed use.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that it would cause adverse impact on street parking.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that Send is in green belt. The proposed inset is inappropriate due to its permanent green belt status.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that Send Hill is a narrow road result in loss of a turning point for vehicles.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that it would impact the nature reserve nearby. The proposed site is a quality green belt amenity area within countryside and would be spoilt by development.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the existing road and parking infrastructure is already inadequate or under pressure and could worsen with the planned development, reducing quality of life.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that too many houses are proposed to Send/ Send Marsh are and the impact on traffic congestion and local services would be unacceptable.
I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the proposed number of houses potentially could result in 92 extra cars in Send Hill which is already suffering from congestion particularly at school run time.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that this would cause loss of village identity, be detrimental to the community and increased flood risk.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that a Wasteland Solutions environmental report on Send Hill dated March 2004 gave evidence of past ponding of water in the excavated area. Further development would disturb water table and increase risk of flooding to my property.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the proposed development site (A44) was used as GBC registered landfill site, not a quarry as listed as reference LLA 2081 in the local plan.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the 1963-8 Ordnance Survey maps of proposed site mark it as “refuse and slag heap”. It is therefore unsuitable for such a development on health reasons.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the 1971 Ordnance Survey maps of proposed site mark it as “refuse tip” prior to when proper licensing/registration was required. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. I therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials.

GBC has installed gas monitoring wells on site since July 2000. One well recording methane gas discharge.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that a Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005-Identifies the proposed site as GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/11/LLC with type of waste not identified. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. I therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that a Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005-Identifies proposed site GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/12 with type of waste identified as “unrestricted”. This causes me concern as to what it does contain and dangers if disturbed.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that both the Envirosearch Report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004 and historical map data and information from GBC has identified site as landfill and has “areas of potentially contaminative industrial activities”. Development of this site would be a health hazard. The recent news reports of a child dying from seepage of contaminated ground following flooding prove that developing any such sites is a danger to health. The Daily Mail has also recently had an article on how the dangers of living near landfill site raises cancer concerns. The paper referenced a study published by the International Journey of Epidemiology which tracked 242,000 people living near landfill sites in Italy.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that both the Envirosearch Report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004 identifies “potential risk from landfill gas migrations” which I believe is a health hazard.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that both Envirosearch Report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004 concludes “potentially contaminative industrial sites identified from analysis” of Ordnance survey maps.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005-Identifies proposed site as a local authorised landfill site as licences under Part II of Environmental protection Act 1990. The proposed site is not a quarry as specified in the GBC Local Plan. And is therefore not suitable for the proposed usage.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005-Identifies proposed site as potentially contaminative industrial land. With usage of “Heap and unknown constituents”. This causes me concern as to what it does contain and dangers if disturbed.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005 Identifies changes to proposed site could cause potential ground water vulnerability to my property.
I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the Traveller Accommodation Assessment research, purported to have been undertaken in June-July 2012 by Mill Field Services, cannot be so. The Sittingbourne based market research company was dissolved in January 2011 according the government companies’ site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3543</th>
<th>Respondent: 10870593 / Maureen Blackburn</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )

is Sound? ( )

is Legally Compliant? ( )

Firstly I should like to state that I am appalled that after my objection over two years ago (one of 20,000). I should have to repeat the process. I consider the process now to be totally undemocratic and I now have no faith at all in local and national government.

All consideration: of Green Belt; infrastructure issues; insufficient school places; road access.

I live in Orchard Way and access is very difficult one might say almost impossible currently when schools are opening and closing.

The proposed development of houses and travellers site are ludicrous considering the narrowness of Send Hill. The loss of Green Belt is a disgrace especially when it was pledged to maintain it.

I took nearly ten minutes to get from Orchard Way to Send Surgery because of the school run and parked cars which are permanently there.

This would be much worse if the Send Hill developments go ahead.

The infrastructure; Schools, parking access, doctor's surgery and access for fire engines does not figure in the plan.

**Send Hill**

I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the site is not large enough for the proposed use.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that it would cause adverse impact on street parking.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that Send is in green belt. The proposed inset is inappropriate due to its permanent green belt status.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that Send Hill is a narrow road result in loss of a turning point for vehicles.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that it would impact the nature reserve nearby. The proposed site is a quality green belt amenity area within countryside and would be spoilt by development.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the existing road and parking infrastructure is already inadequate or under pressure and could worsen with the planned development, reducing quality of life.
I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that too many houses are proposed to Send/ Send Marsh are and the impact on traffic congestion and local services would be unacceptable.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the proposed number of houses potentially could result in 92 extra cars in Send Hill which is already suffering from congestion particularly at school run time.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that this would cause loss of village identity, be detrimental to the community and increased flood risk.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that a Wasteland Solutions environmental report on Send Hill dated March 2004 gave evidence of past ponding of water in the excavated area. Further development would disturb water table and increase risk of flooding to my property.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the proposed development site (A44) was used as GBC registered landfill site, not a quarry as listed as reference LLA 2081 in the local plan.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the 1963-8 Ordnance Survey maps of proposed site mark it as “refuse and slag heap”. It is therefore unsuitable for such a development on health reasons.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the 1971 Ordnance Survey maps of proposed site mark it as “refuse tip” prior to when proper licensing/registration was required. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. I therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials.

GBC has installed gas monitoring wells on site since July 2000. One well recording methane gas discharge.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that a Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005-Identifies the proposed site as GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/11/LLC with type of waste not identified. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. I therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that both the Envirosearch Report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004 and historical map data and information from GBC has identified site as landfill and has “areas of potentially contaminative industrial activities”. Development of this site would be a health hazard. The recent news reports of a child dying from seepage of contaminated ground following flooding prove that developing any such sites is a danger to health. The Daily Mail has also recently had an article on how the dangers of living near landfill site raises cancer concerns. The paper referenced a study published by the International Journal of Epidemiology which tracked 242,000 people living near landfill sites in Italy.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that both the Envirosearch Report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004 identifies “potential risk from landfill gas migrations” which I believe is a health hazard.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that both the Envirosearch Report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004 concludes “potentially contaminative industrial sites identified from analysis” of Ordnance survey maps.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the proposed site could cause potential ground water vulnerability to my property.
I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the Traveller Accommodation Assessment research, purported to have been undertaken in June-July 2012 by Mill Field Services, cannot be so. The Sittingbourne based market research company was dissolved in January 2011 according the government companies’ site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7567  Respondent: 10872353 / Robin Williams  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill. This is a highly inappropriate location in a high amenity area of beautiful countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7477  Respondent: 10873313 / Rob Stevens  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed development in Send Hill. Put the pitches in the vast land at Ockham on Wisley Airfield. Send Hill is a tiny lane and can't take any more traffic. Consider the area before making these poor suggestions. The area is also I understand a unsafe landfill area put back to countryside. What are you thinking?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/667  Respondent: 10874817 / J. I Harris  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the new proposal of building of 40 homes and 2 travellers pitches west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill. This is a new proposal and not included in the regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon. Development of houses is inappropriate as the road is very narrow with no pavement or lighting. The land to be used for development was previously used for landfill waste which has to be vented. The are is very popular with dog walkers and is an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt by any development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4773  Respondent: 10876993 / Michael Hurdle  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6378</th>
<th>Respondent: 10877249 / Ann Hamilton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object – Land in Green Belt; resulting traffic using Send Hill which has single track road in one direction and the busiest junction in the village in the other, adding further pressure to traffic. There are concerns over the safety of landfill waste in the ground.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3920</th>
<th>Respondent: 10878081 / Linda June Turner</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The designation of land wet of Winds Ridge and Send Hill for 40 homes and 2 Travellers’ Pitches. This site is NEW and was NOT included in the regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted upon previously. This is a permanent Green Belt site within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoiled by development. Also, the subsoil contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. Bearing in mind the lack of public transport in the area it is safe to assume that the number of cars will greatly increase - the narrow width single track country lane providing access to the site makes it totally inadequate for settlements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7011</th>
<th>Respondent: 10878561 / Amy Dowsett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Send Hill proposal for 40 homes and 2 traveller sites

Send Hill IS II very narrow road and would not support movements of caravans. This land has also been used for landfill previously and is therefore unsuitable for development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
There are no pavements and pedestrians have to walk along the road. Many villagers use Send Hill in order to visit St Mary's Church and the cemetery which has recently been extended, as well as dog walkers and cyclists, ramblers and, of course, residents.

The land is filled with mature native trees, wildflowers and attendant wildlife. Part of it is an old tip which has methane gas meters across it. It is directly behind existing housing and faces Send Hill, a former quarry which was landscaped when it closed down.

There is a huge amount of wildlife on this area including rare species. Before the land was "landscaped" you could find sand lizards and there were hundreds of Sand Martin nests in the sand wall below the original footpath. These were completely destroyed by bulldozers.

There are still grass snakes, slow worms, and a neighbour has seen adders. More importantly, I have seen two smooth snakes in this vicinity.

There are bats, owls, woodpeckers, red kites, buzzards, sparrowhawks, kestrels, stonechats, redwings, cuckoos, and numerous other bird species.

Badgers, foxes, deer, rabbits, hares, stoats and other mammals reside, feed or traverse the hill. Building on this site will destroy yet more of our natural world.

The road is narrow by the proposed site and access for extra vehicles, lorries, caravans etc., would be difficult to say the least. The extra traffic would put pedestrians and cyclists at severe risk.

Send Hill has a restriction on having caravans, mobile homes and any structures placed upon it.

The location of Send Cemetery on the hill is a peaceful and beautiful site with spectacular sunset views, fields and trees. It is a tranquil place for thought and remembrance and should not be ruined by housing, noise, traffic and traveller sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
There are bats, owls, woodpeckers, red kites, buzzards, sparrowhawks, kestrels, stonechats, redwings, cuckoos, and numerous other bird species.

Badgers, foxes, deer, rabbits, hares, stoats and other mammals reside, feed or traverse the hill. Building on this site will destroy yet more of our natural world.

The road is narrow by the proposed site and access for extra vehicles, lorries, caravans etc., would be difficult to say the least. The extra traffic would put pedestrians and cyclists at severe risk.

Send Hill has a restriction on having caravans, mobile homes and any structures placed upon it.

The location of Send Cemetery on the hill is a peaceful and beautiful site with spectacular sunset views, fields and trees. It is a tranquil place for thought and remembrance and should not be ruined by housing, noise, traffic and traveller sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3025</th>
<th>Respondent: 10879457 / Louisa Scott</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send hill. the access to this is insufficient as the road is narrow and single track.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6543</th>
<th>Respondent: 10880481 / James Anderson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yet another ridiculous idea! As with the Clockbarn proposal, the effect of the additional traffic on the already congested Send Road will be significant and unacceptable. Send Hill is also a narrow residential lane and will be badly affected by the additional traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6609</th>
<th>Respondent: 10880481 / James Anderson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill. Send Hill is a narrow width residential lane and will be badly affected by the additional traffic. As with the Clockbarn proposal, the impact of the additional traffic on the already congested Send Road will be significant and unacceptable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7432  Respondent: 10880609 / S. Groves  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 Travellers’ pitches at Send Hill. It is an inappropriate location because the narrow width, single access country road provides insufficient access. The subsoil of the proposed site contains documented unsafe landfill waste registered at GBC. Any development of this site would spoil a high amenity area set in beautiful countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6353  Respondent: 10881217 / Ben Stevens  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I also object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to the subsoil of the existing site which contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. In addition, the proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/787  Respondent: 10882785 / Stephen Fleming  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

11. I object to the inclusion of land west of Wind Ridge and Send Hill designated for 40 homes and 2 Travellers' Pitches (Policy A44). The site was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon prior to the inclusion in the 2016 Local Plan.

12. I object to the impact of Policy A44 on an area of beautiful Green Belt countryside.

13. I object to the impact of Policy A44 as the subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented.
14. I object to the impact of Policy A44, which includes 2 Travellers' Pitches, on the local infrastructure. The narrow width single track country road provides insufficient access for the pitches.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6427  Respondent: 10894945 / Peter Pearce  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the 40 houses planned west of Winds Ridge & Send Hill & the Traveller Site, for several reasons

It is already too narrow to take existing traffic and has poor vehicular visability on exiting at the Potters Lane offset junction.

There is no room for long vehicles and the access road is not big enough for increased traffic.

The land in question is on the greenbelt & outside the current settlement boundary.

Ironically a planning application right next to this area APP/Y3615/W/16/3144141 Send Hill Farm, Potters Lane has already been declined on the basis that it would cause harm to the openness of the Green Belt, yet here we have the Council wanting to build so many more houses on huge areas of the Green Belt in the area!

Some of this land is also farmed and grazed and any substantial building work will be detrimental to the area.

I further object to the "Trojan" effect of locating two travellers pitches at the Send Hill site. This would give access to, and encourage occupation by unlicensed travellers on Gypsy own land immediately adjoining the proposed site. Siting of pitches in this location has been recommended to GBC via Surrey County Councillor Hilda Brazil who is a relative of this land owner which seems inappropriate and constitutes a Trojan application which will further perpetuate unnecessary and massive difficulties of enforcement for GBC and potential issues for adjoining householders in Send Hill.

I further object to the fact that Travellers requirements in the area have been similarly over assessed and are based on out of date Assessments.

The schools in the area are already at full capacity & there are no funds or plan to increase the schools for additional pupil numbers.

The Doctors Surgery is already fully stretched & has no capacity for a substantial increase in patient numbers.

I OBJECT also to the housing being sited on land known to have been an unregulated Tip for many years which if disturbed could release seriously toxic materials and give rise to uninsurable liabilities which would seriously impact GBC's budget for clean up costs. This land is still subject to gas monitoring and does not recommend itself to family housing!

It is detrimental to the health of Send residents, as has already happened in Chertsey which has sadly led to illness & death. We do NOT want a repeat of this for the residents of Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6381  Respondent: 10895009 / Holly Broughton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3187  Respondent: 10895137 / Katrina Broughton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3817  Respondent: 10897665 / Sue French  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A44 Land West of Winds Ridge and Send Hill designated for 40 houses and 2 Travellers Pitches. It is a new site, inserted in the plan at the last minute and not previously consulted on under Regulation 18. Again Send Hill is a narrow road which cannot take more traffic. It is on Green Belt land which should not be regarded as suitable for building.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6007  Respondent: 10898113 / V A Lewis  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal for 40 houses and two traveller pitches (policy A44) – a site prone to flooding and containing documented unsafe landfill waste – with insufficient access via a narrow single track.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/6000  
**Respondent:** 10898145 / Louise French  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to Policy A44 Winds Ridge and Send Hill. Why has this area been chosen for development and slipped into the Plan at the last minute? Part of it is contaminated land, it is again on a narrow lane with traffic problems, and is unsuitable for building on. It is open grassland and a valuable habitat for wildlife and wild flowers which are so valuable to our wellbeing.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1350  
**Respondent:** 10899233 / Frederick Hookins  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2391  
**Respondent:** 10900609 / Beverley Gear  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the proposal for land in Send Hill to be used for 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches. Again this is new proposal which has not been previously consulted upon. This area has permanent Green Belt status and the beautiful area would be spoilt by any development. The existing site is currently vented as it has unsafe landfill waste and should not be used. The 2 travellers pitches are also inappropriate because the narrow single track lane would provide insufficient access to the site with their large vehicles, especially the access from the bend on Potters Lane which is extremely dangerous!

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6600  
**Respondent:** 10902401 / Nick Enderby  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I strongly object to the development of 40 houses and travellers pitches on Send Hill. This is an area of rural beauty and to create such a development would completely undermine the countryside.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/4239  Respondent: 10903265 / M Stokes  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy a -Land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill, Send.

The proposal to build 40 houses and two travellers' pitches here is new and was not included in the Regulation 18draftandhasnotbeenconsultedonpreviously. The development is inappropriate due to its permanent Green Belt Status and also the site contains documented unsafe landfill waste, which is currently vented. It is also an inappropriate location due to the fact it is a narrow width single access country lane particularly at its junction with Potters Lane. It has a narrow access onto the bend with very limited vision for turning either right or left and is extremely dangerous. Potters Lane itself is narrow and again this lane in places is single track.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1695  Respondent: 10905185 / D White  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the housing proposal at Send Hill/Winds Ridge. The Plan acknowledges former quarry workings but makes no mention of the land being contaminated by landfill. Neither does it refer to the venting of the land to dispel underground gases.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4267  Respondent: 10906145 / Joe Gervasio  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill

This is a high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/5416  Respondent: 10906145 / Joe Gervasio  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to removal of Brownfield site (A34) from the Plan

Site A44 in Broadford Business Park has also been removed. This is another brownfield site that has already been developed. The Council’s claims to “have adopted a ‘brownfield first’ approach” (page 5) but this is clearly not the case, and is contrary to national guidelines.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7201</th>
<th>Respondent: 10912513 / Sarah Green</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to the impact of Policy A44 on an area of beautiful Green Belt countryside.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I object to the impact of Policy A44 as the subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the impact of Policy A44, which includes 2 Travellers’ Pitches, on the local infrastructure. The narrow width single track country road provides insufficient access for the pitches.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1845</th>
<th>Respondent: 10913377 / Isabelle Stevens</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill as this high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside would be spoilt for ever. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4252</th>
<th>Respondent: 10914849 / Robert Yates</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill - This land is inappropriate for development due to the fact that it contains unsafe landfill waste, and this lane will also not suitable for more traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On Policy A44. 1.9a LAND WEST OF WINDS RIDGE AND SEND HILL

1. I object to the proposal on the grounds that Send Hill is in part a single track country road and too narrow, particularly at the Potters Lane junction, to accommodate the extra traffic the proposed development would bring.

2. I object to the proposal on the grounds that Send is in Green Belt. The proposed inset is inappropriate due to its permanent green belt status.

3. I object to the proposal on the grounds that the existing roads and parking infrastructure is already inadequate and could not cope with the extra traffic.

4. I object to the proposal on the grounds that the proposed development site (A44) was used as a GBC registered landfill site. Disturbance of the site would be a health hazard due to the unknown materials in the site.

5. I object to the inclusion of Traveller Accommodation in Send Hill due to the disturbance to an existing community. If significant development is in prospect then Traveller Accommodation should be planned as an integral part of such new development (as for affordable housing) rather than imposed on an existing community.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Additionally I have the following comments regarding four Site Allocations – all of which I OBJECT to for reasons given

1. Site Allocation A44 (Land West of Winds Ridge and Send Hill, Send)

I OBJECT
The area in mind is accessed by two very narrow roads – Send Hill on the one side and Potters Lane from the other. Extending the number of houses by 40 as well as the two proposed traveller pitches (meaning larger cars and most likely caravans) will put more pressure on these roads. As it is, Potters Lane, as it nears the junction with Send Hill, already has major traffic issues with people parking on kerbs and not leaving space for pedestrians (so bad that more than once a blind resident of that area who relies on their guide dog was unable to get to town because the kerb was blocked by cars, traffic was heading through the narrow gap on the road; resulting in the guide dog being unable to safely guide her further and turned them around to go home).

In addition, the proposed land used to be a landfill which was used for unsafe waste – something GBC is well aware of. From a health and safety aspect alone this site should not be developed on and most certainly not until a full and through environmental inspection of the land has been carried out by an INDEPENDENT contractor.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1815  Respondent: 10918497 / Darren Moss  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

4/ I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and two travellers pitches at this site in Send Hill. It is a completely inappropriate location because the narrow single width access to the country road provides insufficient access and would be very dangerous. This is an extremely busy road especially in the early morning with many parents taking their children through this route to send school. It is a beautiful site which was previously a landfill site and for this reason alone it should not be built on. This site has been refused before for the above reasons and I urge you to remove this from the local plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3803  Respondent: 10919841 / J.A. Millard  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I STRONGLY OBJECT to a new development of 40 houses and 2 travelers pitches at Send Hill. Again this is an excessive development for the location and will ruin another area of pleasant countryside. This insidious erosion of the countryside around Send is not what local residents want.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2254  Respondent: 10920961 / Mark Stevens  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
As if Send wasn’t already the target for some pretty ridiculous development plans, GBC have now come up with an idea of squeezing in additional properties at Send Hill. This is a popular spot amongst local residents for dog walkers and ramblers and the community has worked hard to make this little space a genuine amenity to local people. The site is not large enough for the proposed use. Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that it would impact the nature reserve nearby. The proposed site is a quality green belt amenity area within countryside and would be spoilt forever by development. I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the proposed number of houses potentially could result in a significant number of extra cars in Send Hill which already suffers from congestion on occasion, especially with parents doing the school run.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5855  Respondent: 10921633 / Emma Loosley  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe landfill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7427  Respondent: 10921921 / V Groves  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 Travellers' pitches at Send Hill. It is an inappropriate location because the narrow width, single access country road provides insufficient access. The subsoil of the proposed site contains documented unsafe landfill waste registered at GBC. Any development of this site would spoil a high amenity area set in beautiful countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2824  Respondent: 10922689 / Kathleen Grehan  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
4. 40 houses and 2 travelers’ pitches at Send Hill

I object strongly to this development. Send Hill is another country lane that cannot take any more traffic. It is already impossible to drive up Send Hill during school drop off and pick up times. Also the site itself is an old general waste landfill site. Surely it is not wise to build on such a site? The footpath that goes through the site is very widely used and is an exceptionally pretty part of our village. Two travelers’ pitches seem strange. To my knowledge travelers’ enjoy being in larger sites with other travelers. Also this is an exceptionally small area for such a development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4245  Respondent: 10923873 / Dennis Gordon  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of land west of Winds ridge and Send Hill.

This site was not included in the regulation 18 Draft Local Plan so has not had full consultation. The site to my knowledge contains documented unsafe landfill waste which was registered with Guildford Borough Council.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2918  Respondent: 10924225 / Anne Sparkes  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the site is not large enough to the proposed use.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that it would cause adverse impact on street parking.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that send is in green belt. The proposed inset is inappropriate due to its permanent green belt status.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that Send Hill is a narrow road result in loss of a turning point for vehicles.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that it would impact the nature reserve nearby. The proposed site is a quality green belt amenity area within countryside and would be spoilt by development.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the existing road and parking infrastructure is already inadequate or under pressure and could worsen with the planned development, reducing quality of life.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that too many houses are proposed to Send/Send Marsh are and the impact on traffic congestion and local services would be unacceptable.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the proposed number of houses potentially could result in 92 extra cars in Send Hill which is already suffering from congestion particularly at school run time.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that this would cause loss of village identity, be detrimental to the community and increased flood risk.
I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that a Wasteland Solutions environmental report on Send Hill dated March 2004 gave evidence of past ponding of water in the excavated area. Further development would disturb water table and increase risk of flooding to my property.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the proposed development site (A44) was used as GBC registered landfill site, not a quarry as listed as reference LLA 2081 in the local plan.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the 1963-8 Ordnance Survey maps of proposed site mark it as "refuse and sag heap". It is therefore unsuitable for such a development on health reasons.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the 1971 Ordnance Survey maps of proposed site mark it as "refuse tip" prior to when proper licensing/registration was required. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU landfill Directive regulations. I therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials.

GBC has installed gas monitoring wells on site since July 2000. One well recording methane gas discharge.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that a Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN-HCP dated 5 January 2005 identifies proposed site as GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/11/LLC with type of waste not identified. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. I therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that both the Envirossearch Report RSI 100201-1-1 dated 17th February 2004 and historical map data and information from GBC has identified site as landfill and has "areas of potentially contaminative industrial activities". Development of this site would be a health hazard. The recent news reports of a child dying from seepage of contaminated ground following flooding prove that developing any such sites is a danger to health. The Daily Mail has also recently had an article on how dangers of living near landfill site raises cancer concerns. The paper referenced a study published by the international journey of Epidemiology which tracked 242,000 people living near landfill sites in Italy.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that both the Envirossearch Report RS 110001-1-1 dated 17th February 2004 identifies "potential risk from landfill gas migrations" which I believe is a health hazard.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that both Envirosearch Report RS 1100201-1-1 dated 17th February 2004 concludes "potentially contaminative industrial sites identified from analysis" of Ordnance survey maps.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN-HCP dated 5 January 2005 identifies proposed site as a local authorised landfill site as licences under Part 11 of Environmental protection Act 1990. The proposed site is not a quarry as specified in

The GBC Local Plan. Therefore not suitable for the proposed usage.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN-HCP dated 5th January 2005 identifies proposed site as potentially contaminative industrial land. With usage of "Heap and unknown constituents". This causes me concern as to what it does contain and dangers if disturbed.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN-HCP 5th January 2005 identifies changes to proposed site could cause potential ground water vulnerability to my property.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the Traveller Accommodation Assessment research, purported to have been undertaken in June-July 2012 by Mill Field Services, cannot be so. The Sittingbourne based market research company was dissolved in January 2011 according to the government companies site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/821</th>
<th>Respondent: 10924897 / Louis Botha</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site A44 - Send Hill:</td>
<td>I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill. It consists of particularly high quality Green Belt within an area of particularly beautiful countryside which would be destroyed by this development. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe landfill waste which is currently vented. The proposal for 2 travelers’ pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I object to the fact that this site was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously. Full consultation is required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3367</th>
<th>Respondent: 10925217 / AW Winterborne</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at send hill…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate location because of the narrow width single access country road provides insufficient access. The subsoil of the site contains unsafe toxic landfill.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5833</th>
<th>Respondent: 10927553 / Marion Harris</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I object to the proposed building of 40 more houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill. The road is extremely narrow and quite unsuitable for such a development. I understand this was a former landfill site and is therefore unsuitable for housing development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3050</th>
<th>Respondent: 10928993 / James Sparkes</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the site is not large enough to the proposed use.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that it would cause adverse impact on street parking.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that Send is in green belt. The proposed inset is inappropriate due to its permanent green belt status.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that Send Hill is a narrow road result in loss of a turning point for vehicles.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that it would impact the nature reserve nearby. The proposed site is a quality green belt amenity area within countryside and would be spoilt by development.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the existing road and parking infrastructure is already inadequate or under pressure and could worsen with the planned development, reducing quality of life.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that too many houses are proposed to Send/Send Marsh and the impact on traffic congestion and local services would be unacceptable.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that both the Envirosearch Report RS 1100201-1-1 dated 17th February 2004 and historical map data and information from GBC has identified site as landfill and has "areas of potentially contaminative industrial activities". Development of this site would be a health hazard. The recent news reports of a child dying from seepage of contaminated ground following flooding prove that developing any such sites is a danger to health. The Daily Mail has also recently had an article on how dangers of living near landfill site raises cancer concerns. The paper referenced a study published by the international journey of Epidemiology which tracked 242,000 people living near landfill sites in Italy.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that both the Envirosearch Report RS110001-1-1 dated 17th February 2004 identifies "potential risk from landfill gas migrations "which I believe is a health hazard .

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that both Envirosearch Report RSI 100201-1-1 dated 17th February 2004 Concludes "potentially contaminative industrial sites identified from analysis of Ordnance survey maps.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the rounds that the Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN-HCP dated 5 January 2005-Identifies proposed site as a local authorized landfill site as licenses under Part 11 of Environmental protection Act 1990. The proposed site is not a quarry as specified in The GBC Local Plan. Therefore not suitable for the proposed usage.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN-HCP dated 5th January 2005-Identifies proposed site as potentially contaminative industrial land. With usage of "Heap and unknown constituents". This causes me concern as to what it does contain and dangers if disturbed.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN-HCP 5th January 2005 Identifies changes to proposed site could cause potential ground water vulnerability to my property.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the Traveller Accommodation Assessment research, purported to have been undertaken in June-July 2012 by Mill Field Services, cannot be so. The Sittingbourne based market research company was dissolved in January 2011 according to the government companies site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7542</th>
<th>Respondent: 10933569 / Rosamund Ebdon</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td><strong>( ), is Sound?</strong></td>
<td><strong>( ), is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposals in the local plan (Policy A44.1.9 ha land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill designated for 40 houses and 2 traveller pitches) on the grounds that Send Hill, where I live, is a single track country road with blind bends on a very steep hill and is too narrow and would be too dangerous to provide access to the site proposed in the plan. This was a new addition and was not included in the regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted on. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented and is unsuitable for housing. Disturbing the soil would be a health hazard and causes me great concern.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposals in the local plan on the grounds that Send Hill could not accommodate the increased levels of traffic that the proposed new development would bring, this being a potential of an extra 92 cars.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposals in the local plan on the grounds that there are too many houses proposed for Send and Send Marsh. The impact on local services including the doctors surgery and schools would be unacceptable and unmanageable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposals in the local plan on the grounds that the congestion caused by the increased volume of vehicles resulting from the large numbers of new houses proposed in the area, would be unacceptable. The roads are already highly congested at peak times and Send Road would become totally grid-locked and unusable. Send is already used as a rat run into Woking in the mornings and evenings and could not take any more traffic. This would utterly destroy the nature of the village and the well-being of its residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7390</th>
<th>Respondent: 10934689 / Adam Fox</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td><strong>( ), is Sound?</strong></td>
<td><strong>( ), is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 traveller pitches at Send Hill, it is an inappropriate location and residents in Send do not welcome this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2419</th>
<th>Respondent: 10935009 / Richard Winton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td><strong>( ), is Sound?</strong></td>
<td><strong>( ), is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to land west of winds ridge and send hill allocation A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment ID: PSLPS16/4127  Respondent: 10935137 / Jack Winton  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill allocation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7328  Respondent: 10936929 / William McGowan  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of 40 houses and two travellers’ pitches at Send. It is an unsuitable location due to the narrow access road. The subsoil of the proposed site contains documented unsafe landfill waste registered at GBC. Development will again ruin a high amenity area set in beautiful countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5838  Respondent: 10937025 / Louise McGowan  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers’ pitches at Send Hill. It would be an inappropriate location because the single access road does not provide adequate access. Also, there is unsafe landfill waste registered on the site with Guildford Borough Council.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4414  Respondent: 10940673 / Carolyn Davis  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the proposed Send Hill development (A44)

I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers’ pitches at Send Hill. This site is a new addition to the Plan and was not included in the regulation 18 draft; therefore it has NOT been consulted upon previously. It is an inappropriate
location due to the permanent Green Belt status. The narrow width single access country road provides insufficient access.

In addition, the subsoil of the proposed site contains documented unsafe landfill waste registered at GBC. Any development there would spoil a high amenity area set in beautiful countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6659  Respondent: 10941057 / Tim Green  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of land west of Wind Ridge and Send Hill designated for 40 homes and 2 Travellers’ Pitches (Policy A44). The site was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon prior to the inclusion in the 2016 Local Plan.

I object to the impact of Policy A44 on an area of beautiful Green Belt countryside.

I object to the impact of Policy A44 as the subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented.

I object to the impact of Policy A44, which includes 2 Travellers’ Pitches, on the local infrastructure. The narrow width single track country road provides insufficient access for the pitches.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8080  Respondent: 10952257 / Darrel Wilkinson  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I write this email to register my objection to the draft Guildford Development Plan. Overall I feel the scale of this development is too much for the small village of Send.

I object to the development in Policy A44. 1.9a Land West of Winds Ridge and Send Hill site on the following grounds:

• I object on the grounds neither the Council nor Chris Brown own all of the right-of-way into the land in question. My wife (Martha Wilkinson) and I own a lot of this right-of-way and have chartered land surveyor drawings as well as the deeds to our property documenting this. We will not sell or release this land for development or access;
• I object on the grounds that it would have a detrimental impact on the wildlife, some of which is endangered; there are little owls, bats, slow worms and crested nutes on the ground in question among many other species
• I object on the grounds that Send is in the green belt. The proposed inset is inappropriate due to its permanent green belt status.
• I object on the grounds that Send Hill is a narrow road and goes down to a single lane on one end and cannot support this extra traffic. It already suffers from bad congestion, especially during school times.
• I object on the grounds the site is not large enough for the proposed use.
• I object on the grounds the proposed site is not fit for development as more than half of it is landfill and contains harmful multiple different types of asbestos waste which will be dangerous to disturb and remove. What
assurances can Guildford Borough Council and, the developer in question, give that there would be zero health risk to existing residents as a result of this proposed new development?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I write this email to register my objection to the draft Guildford Development Plan. Overall I feel the scale of this development is too much for the small village of Send.

I object to the development in Policy A44. 1.9a Land West of Winds Ridge and Send Hill site on the following grounds:

• I object on the grounds neither the Council nor Chris Brown own all of the right-of-way into the land in question. My husband and I own a lot of this right-of-way and have chartered land surveyor drawings as well as the deeds to our property documenting this. We will not sell or release this land for development or access.
• I object on the grounds the site is not large enough for the proposed use.
• I object on the grounds that it would have a detrimental impact on the wildlife, some of which is endangered; there are little owls, bats, slow worms and crested nutes on the ground in question among many other species.
• I object on the grounds the proposed site is not fit for development as more than half of it is landfill and contains harmful multiple different types of asbestos waste which will be dangerous to disturb and remove. What assurances can Guildford Borough Council and, the developer in question, give that there would be zero health risk to existing residents as a result of this proposed new development?
• I object on the grounds that Send is in the green belt. The proposed inset is inappropriate due to its permanent green belt status.
• I object on the grounds that Send Hill is a narrow road and goes down to a single lane on one end and cannot support this extra traffic. It already suffers from bad congestion, especially during school times.

Additionally, I object to the plan for a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common as Send would have to take traffic from the proposed 2,000 new houses at the Wisely Airfield, 2,000 houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham and 1,850 at Blackwell Farm. Much of this traffic to and from the A3, M25, Woking and Guildford would go through Send. Send Road is already very congested, would become gridlocked (as it does sometimes now with any road-works). Noise and pollution levels, already at excess levels would worsen. The impact would continue through to Old Woking, which also suffers from major congestion.

I request that my comments are shown to the Planning Inspector who will make the decision on the Guildford Local Plan. Please confirm receipt of this email.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
- Its continued inclusion ignores all of our previous objections which include:
  
  o The fact that my husband and I own part of the right-of-way onto the land. We have drawings that prove our land goes beyond the boundary line of our hedge. We have never received a response to this from Guildford Borough Council
  
  o The loss of rare wildlife

- The contamination. The site is a former land fill containing different levels of asbestos. How can residents be assured that if development is undertaken, this will be safely removed without any health risks to us.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4204  **Respondent:** 10953793 / Hugh Thomas  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers’ pitches on Send Hill because the location is unsuitable. The subsoil of the proposed site contains unsafe landfill waste dating back to the 1960s when it was shown on Ordnance Survey maps as “refuse and slag heap”. The date of the landfill pre-dates the EU Landfill Regulations in 1999 but it was registered at GBC from 2005 onwards. Any disturbance could be a health hazard due to unknown substances which are also described as “unrestricted”. It would be dangerous to local residents for this hazardous waste to be disturbed. The site should, therefore, never have been brought forward for consideration. It would definitely not be sufficient to “condition” it as GBC is prone to doing.

I OBJECT to the proposed development at Send Hill since it does not appear to be in accordance with The Government’s 2015 guidelines on traveller sites. GBC’s Traveller Accommodation Assessment of 2012 is acknowledged in their 2016 Sustainability Appraisal as being out of date which has resulted in an over allocation of traveller sites. GBC needed to re-examine its evidence base before coming forward with this proposal in the Local Plan. It seriously failed in its duty of care by not doing so.

I OBJECT to the proposed development at Send Hill because it is on a narrow country road with inadequate on road parking, it is in the Green Belt, near a nature reserve and an amenity area of beautiful countryside. It is an unsuitable location which has been introduced into the Local Plan at the last minute without first doing proper research on the history and characteristics of the site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7354  **Respondent:** 10955809 / Sarah Roach  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I particularly object to the proposal for 40 houses and traveller’s pitches at Send Hill. The road access and local services are not sufficient and would be a blight on the local area. Simply getting my son to school in Ripley is a traffic nightmare in the mornings and year on year it gets worse. The small roads simply cannot cope.

The level of vandalism proposed by the local plan is unacceptable and must be stopped and elected representatives need to serve those who elected them.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
The development of any housing and/or traveller pitches would in no way be compatible with the appearance of the surrounding area and would have a significant adverse impact on the quality of the environment and character of the locality including water supply, waste management sewerage, pollution (Light, Noise, Air), safety, crime, traffic, visual, nuisance to neighbours on site. It would also have an adverse effect on the peaceful quality of life for existing send hill residents. Send Hill and the two surrounding roads still keep to the unwritten rule or no noise outside on a Sunday morning before 10 o’clock and we would not want that disturbed. The proposed site is on Green Belt Land and should not be allowed.

Traffic – Send hill is apart from school drop off/pick up times, a quiet road which narrows into single track road near to the proposed site and beyond to the junction with potters lane and is totally unsuited to an increase in traffic. Residents feel at ease walking in send hill at present, even though there are no pavements. The increase in vehicular traffic that this proposed development would bring would seriously affect the safety of existing residents, all pedestrians and all cyclists. Indeed send hill is featured in one of the surrey county council’s cycle guides, which we would not want to compromise and has six footpaths leading off in various directions for walkers. The main roads leading to send hill are already overcrowded with queues down to the old Woking mini roundabout and up to the shell garage roundabout at peak times.

Parking Issues – Send hill has enough off-street parking for residents which means there are usually no cars parked in the road – a rare sight for most roads these days! Whilst appreciating that Guildford borough council would I’m sure like to see a reduction in the number of cars, it is unfortunately the case that most households of 2 adults would probably have 2 cars. This being the case, each dwelling built would need 2x off street car spaces for the residents plus at least 1 space off-street car space(s) for visitors, otherwise parking problems will undoubtedly occur. The potential cumulative impact of any on-street parking would have an extremely detrimental effect on the lives of send hill residents living close to the entrance of the new development and the character of the locality as a whole.

Visual – Many residents would have their visual aspect of the countryside completely destroyed and no amount of landscaping would make it attractive or compensate for the views lost

Light Pollution – Street furniture is at a minimum but would increase and light especially would be affected. Send Hill only has one street light (approximately halfway down). The proposed development would have new lighting on site plus all the internal and external home lights which would be intrusive to existing residents overlooking the site. The increase in traffic would mean send hill would require more street lighting (and other signs) for safety reasons which would affect the whole character and appearance of the road. Some existing residents would also feel obliged, whether they wanted to or not, to add more external lights to their homes in order to feel more secure.

Crime – I’m sure that Guildford Borough Council considers crime prevention a very important issue. Residents feel that the opportunities for crime and nuisance would increase with any development on Send Hill and it would not seem logical to try to improve the wellbeing of one selection of the community at the expense of the wellbeing of the existing section of the community.

Utility Infrastructure – All utilities would need to be extended/updated. Water pressure in send hill can at times be very low. Land drainage in the area Is a problem – Most drainage ditches are overgrown, part of the sewerage pipes In send road collapsed some years ago and would surely need updating If any new developments were going to be allowed. The rubbish thrown on the roadsides has increased and the council do not appear to have any scheme to deal with this ongoing unsightly issue. How then will they cope with all the additional waste management issues which will arise from a new development? Major disruption to send hill and the surrounding area would need to take place in order to achieve a proper utility infrastructure and no satisfactory access could possibly be provided by the local road network.

Natural Environment – The land suggested is on green belt land and the long term protection from this type of inappropriate development must surely be a top priority open space is important for its visual impact and its contribution to the quality of life. Send Hill’s fields hedgerows and trees may not be of national importance but are, for us, locally important features that provide refugees and wildlife corridors for many species of insects, birds and animals and any
development would have a damaging effect on all of these, the fields and footpaths surrounding Send Hill also provide leisure relaxation which most definitely would be compromised.

Community – Some facilities are already overcrowded or have been closed. For example, the medical centre in Send, shared with Ripley, has appointments in excess of 10 days, and the last local police station in Ripley has now closed, leaving the nearest police stations in Guildford and Woking covering much larger areas which may mean longer response times. The cemetery which lies along the single track part of Send Hill, has recently been extended. It is a very peaceful place for relatives to visit the local community would not want this tranquillity disturbed.

Hazardous Material – The site proposed is on an old landfill site and Guildford Borough Council have suggested in the past that the site is now free from methane gases produced by normal landfill items. However, no one at Guildford Borough Council can categorically confirm or deny that any asbestos or any other hazardous material was not dumped on the site unless Guildford Borough Council can give an absolute assurance. In writing to residents, it would be irresponsible to use the site for any development as there could be an unacceptable health risk if disturbed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: capture8 JPG (106 KB)
I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site. Surely these could be accommodated at the Wisley development with closer access to the M25 and on a green field site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

OBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF 40 HOUSES AND 2 TRAVELLER’S PITCHES AT SEND HILL.Again very narrow access that can barely take a single car let alone traveller caravans and lorries. This road particularly the steep downhill part into Potters Lane would be lethal from a traffic point of view for cyclists, walkers, motorists and children walking to schools and buses. It would also put pressure on wildlife being in close proximity to the River Wey with commensurate increase in pollution etc. I do find this particularly nonsensical most of this road is effectively a single track, with enough room for one vehicle. For circa 350 metres towards Potters Lane there is only room for one car i.e. 2 cars can’t pass. Please see attached picture. I also have reservations about the honesty of the consultation. Descending from a gypsy family on my mother's side and even with best intentions of authorities it is highly unlikely travellers will live integrated with settled people. This leads me to believe that this may well be just a traveller site and the community will end up being mislead by the council.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
A few photographic examples. This is all very ill thought out. Councillors and politicians need to be better than this.

PLEASE CONFIRM RECEIPT OF THIS COMMUNICATION FROM GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

PLEASE CONFIRM MY COMMUNICATION WILL BE SHOWN TO THE PLANNING INSPECTOR WHO WILL DECIDE THE OUTCOME

SENDHILL running into POTTERS LANE (range rover picture)….think this is self evident could never cope with significant increase in population with travellers using large vehicular transportation i.e., caravans, lorries etc. this is dangerous and not tenable and or 40 additional houses on contaminated community land

ACCIDENTS too many to mention in Potters Lane with ridiculous national speed limit on a narrow winding country lane

FLOODING FROM POTTERS LANE ROADWAY

PRESSURE AND FLOODING ON RIVER WYE (the river has breached this river wall in the past)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
- Rover.jpg (88 KB)
- Flood.jpg (88 KB)
- Suzuki.jpg (158 KB)
- Flood2.jpg (113 KB)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6478  Respondent: 10968481 / Vivienne Ottaway  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal for the Send Hill development of 40 houses and 2 traveller pitches for the following reasons:

- the grounds are not large enough for the proposed development

- Send Hill is a narrow road and not suitable for the amount of additional traffic which would be generated - the site is a former landfill and is already releasing methane. Several reports have indicated that it isn't known what was put into this site when it was used as landfill and so disturbing it could be a health hazard and could contaminate local ground water. I am sure you are now aware of the various reports including Landfill site reference GU/11/LLC, Envirossearch Report RS1100201_1_1 and Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP.

- the site is also unsuitable for travellers for the above reasons and also because of its proximity to existing houses. I question the Traveller Accommodation Assessment report by Mill Field Services as I understand that the company was dissolved in January 2011 and the report mentioned in the plan wasn't published until June/July 2012.

- any development would spoil a high amenity area set in beautiful countryside

- this development was not mentioned in the previous consultation document

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6596  Respondent: 10968481 / Vivienne Ottaway  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A44
2) I object to the proposal for the Send Hill development of 40 houses and 2 traveller pitches for the following reasons:

- the grounds are not large enough for the proposed development

- Send Hill is a narrow road and not suitable for the amount of additional traffic which would be generated - the site is a former landfill and is already releasing methane. Several reports have indicated that it isn't known what was put into this site when it was used as landfill and so disturbing it could be a health hazard and could contaminate local ground water. I am sure you are now aware of the various reports including Landfill site reference GU/11/LLC, Envirosearch Report RS1100201_1_1 and Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP.

- the site is also unsuitable for travellers for the above reasons and also because of its proximity to existing houses. I question the Traveller Accommodation Assessment report by Mill Field Services as I understand that the company was dissolved in January 2011 and the report mentioned in the plan wasn't published until June/July 2012.

- any development would spoil a high amenity area set in beautiful countryside

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

I OBJECT to the exaggerated “housing need” This figure has been conjured up by the consultant to act as a developers charter the figure of 13,860 shows no relationship to the Office of National Statistics (ONS) figures for Guildford they show a very small rise in the general population. This 13,860 figure is far too high and results in the completely unnecessary development of the Green Belt. The way students, economic need and affordability are calculated inflates the housing need. Students should be accommodated by the university on the campus by using planning applications already granted for student accommodation and building over the car park on campus still maintaining the parking below the accommodation, it is the University of Surrey problem not Guildford borough residence problem.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

1. I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the site is not large enough for the proposed use.
2. I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that it would cause adverse impact on street parking.
3. I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.
4. I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that Send is in green belt. The proposed inset is inappropriate due to its permanent green belt status.
5. I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that Send Hill is a narrow road result in loss of a turning and passing point for vehicles.
6. I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that it would impact the nature reserve nearby. The proposed site is a quality green belt amenity area within countryside and would be spoilt by development.
7. I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the existing road and parking infrastructure is already inadequate or under pressure and could worsen with the planned development, reducing quality of life.
8. I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that too many houses are proposed to Send/ Send Marsh are and the impact on traffic congestion and local services would be unacceptable.
9. I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the proposed number of houses potentially could result in 92 extra cars in Send Hill which is already suffering from congestion particularly at school run time.
10. I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that this would cause loss of village identity, be detrimental to the community and increased flood risk.
11. I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that a Wasteland Solutions environmental report on Send Hill dated March 2004 gave evidence of past ponding of water in the excavated area. Further development would disturb water table and increase risk of flooding to my property.
12. I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the proposed development site (A44) was used as GBC registered landfill site, not a quarry as listed as reference LLA 2081 in the local plan.
13. I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the 1963-8 Ordnance Survey maps of proposed site mark it as “refuse and slag heap”. It is therefore unsuitable for such a development on health reasons.
14. I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the 1971 Ordnance Survey maps of proposed site mark it as “refuse tip” prior to when proper licensing/registration was required. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. I therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials.
15. GBC has installed gas monitoring wells on site since July 2000. One well recording methane gas discharge.
16. I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that a Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005-Identifies the proposed site as GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/11/ LLC with type of waste not identified. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. I therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials.
17. I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that a Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005-Identifies proposed site GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/12 with type of waste identified as “unrestricted”. This causes me concern as to what it does contain and dangers if disturbed.
18. I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that both the Enviroscreen Report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004 and historical map data and information from GBC has identified site as landfill and has “areas of potentially contaminative industrial activities”. Development of this site would be a health hazard. The recent news reports of a child dying from seepage of contaminated ground following flooding prove that developing any such sites is a danger to health. The Daily Mail has also recently had an article on how the
dangers of living near landfill site raises cancer concerns. The paper referenced a study published by the International Journal of Epidemiology which tracked 242,000 people living near landfill sites in Italy.

19. I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that both the Envirosearch Report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004 identifies “potential risk from landfill gas migrations” which I believe is a health hazard.

20. I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that both Envirosearch Report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004 concludes “potentially contaminative industrial sites identified from analysis” of Ordnance survey maps.

21. I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005 identifies “potential risk from landfill gas migrations” which I believe is a health hazard.

22. I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005 concludes “potentially contaminative industrial sites identified from analysis” of Ordnance survey maps.

23. I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005 identifies “potential risk from landfill gas migrations” which I believe is a health hazard.

24. I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005 concludes “potentially contaminative industrial sites identified from analysis” of Ordnance survey maps.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5260  Respondent: 11006241 / Sally Harrison  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is **Sound?** ( ), is **Legally Compliant?** ( )

I object to the proposal A42 regarding the development on Send Hill, west of wind’s Ridge, of a small estate and the provision of two travellers pitches. I object on the grounds that Send Hill is not suitable for an increase in traffic, especially at the Potters Lane end. The road is far too narrow. I object to the construction of housing as this is also a beautiful part of the village with much wildlife living there. It is a place where many people walk. I object because this site is landfill and there is a possible problem with gas escape and contamination.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3192  Respondent: 11007713 / Grahame Crispin  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is **Sound?** ( ), is **Legally Compliant?** ( )

I OBJECT to the validity of Guildford Borough Council’s evidence base used to demonstrate a need for the above Policies being objected to (namely P2, A42, A43, A43a, A44).

Required Employment space versus 2015 ELNA & 2013 ELNA has been overstated.

Housing needs (2015 SHMA) have been overstated by including, for example, foreign students.
The number of houses that is suggested as being required has been exaggerated by GBC; a more realistic lower requirement could be satisfied by the re-use of brown-field sites, and Green Belt land does not need to be encroached into.

At the time it was voted upon (24/5/16), Guildford Borough Council’s Local Plan did not take account of Guildford Borough Council’s Transport Assessment (not available until weeks afterwards on 6/6/16).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3384  Respondent: 11011041 / Alan C Burchett  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. 40 houses and 2 travellers’ pitches at Send Hill

I object to this development.

This is definitely not suitable land to build houses on as it is a landfill site. When I first moved into the village I was a builder and I used this site to dump all my building waste, everything went in it, including I believe blue asbestos. It would be wrong to expect people to live on this site either in houses or in travellers’ caravans. I would make it my business to explain to any perspective buyers just what their houses were built on. It would be my moral duty!

Send Hill is a narrow country lane which already suffers from severe congestion when the school traffic is at its busiest. Speeding cars also using it as a route off the A3 from Potters Lane. Also the main drains could not take the extra capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4197  Respondent: 11011585 / Martin Walker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill. It consists of particularly high quality Green Belt within an area of particularly beautiful countryside which would be destroyed by this development. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe landfill waste which is currently vented. The proposal for 2 travelers’ pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

I object to the fact that this site was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously. Full consultation is required.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3162  Respondent: 11011969 / Diana Gibson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill. It consists of particularly high quality Green Belt within an area of particularly beautiful countryside which would be destroyed by this development. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe landfill waste which is currently vented. The proposal for 2 travelers’ pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

I object to the fact that this site was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously. Full consultation is required.
I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/304  Respondent: 11016001 / Brenda Tulloch  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With reference Policy A44 (Land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill) in the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites June 2016

I object to the inclusion of this site because it is NEW and was not included in the regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted upon previously.

I object because its development for housing is inappropriate owing to its permanent Green Belt status. The Green Belt was originally proposed in 1935 to ensure space between villages and not turn into an urban sprawl. No one has the right to take this away from us – once its gone its gone for ever which will have a huge impact for our future generations.

I object on Health and Safely grounds since the subsoil of the existing landfill site contains documented unsafe landfill waste which is currently vented and monitored. Any disturbance of this waste for housing development gives rise to environmental risks (methane gas, asbestos etc). When purchasing our home in 2010 our Environmental Survey reported issues with regards to the landfill site – we experienced lengthy delays whilst consulting with Guildford Borough Council over this matter.

I object to the siting of the development because the narrow width single track country road (with no pavement) provides insufficient access, particularly with the expected increase in traffic. The road already gets blocked due to the school at the end of the road twice a day.

I object to the adverse impact on the tranquillity of the recently enlarged cemetery.

I object to the loss of wildlife habitat as the site is home to many species of bird, reptile and insect.

I object to the adverse impact on the character of the village as a desirable, pleasant place to live. The proposal to build over 400 houses will have a huge impact on the local schools, doctors and transport.

I wish my objections to be brought to the attention of the Government’s Planning Inspector.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2343  Respondent: 11016001 / Brenda Tulloch  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OBJECTIONS TO THE LOCAL PLAN

With reference Policy A44 (Land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill) in the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites June 2016
I object to the inclusion of this site because it is NEW and was not included in the regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted upon previously.

I object because its development for housing is inappropriate owing to its permanent Green Belt status. The Green Belt was originally proposed in 1935 to ensure space between villages and not turn into an urban sprawl. No one has the right to take this away from us - once its gone its gone for ever which will have a huge impact for our future generations.

I object on Health and Safely grounds since the subsoil of the existing landfill site contains documented unsafe landfill waste which is currently vented and monitored. Any disturbance of this waste for housing development gives rise to environmental risks (methane gas, asbestos etc). When purchasing our home in 2010 our Environmental Survey reported issues with regards to the landfill site - we experienced lengthy delays whilst consulting with Guildford Borough Council over this matter.

I object to the siting of the development because the narrow width single track country road (with no pavement) provides insufficient access, particularly with the expected increase in traffic. The road already gets blocked due to the school at the end of the road twice a day.

I object to the adverse impact on the tranquillity of the recently enlarged cemetery.

I object to the adverse impact on the character of the village as a desirable, pleasant place to live. The proposal to build over 400 houses will have a huge impact on the local schools, doctors and transport.

I wish my objections to be brought to the attention of the Government's Planning Inspector.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/108  **Respondent:** 11024385 / Alison and Peter Parrott  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to proposal A44 Winds ridge, because this is a new site and is totally unsuitable for 40 new houses and two traveller site, because the road is very narrow, single track and already badly congested. Also this is a new site and is not included in the original draft. The land also has permanent green belt status.

Please let the inspector see my views

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7347  **Respondent:** 11027137 / I Pennells  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A44 Land west of Winds Ridge, Send Hill, Send

- Send Hill is unlit and is too narrow and bendy for 2-way traffic without footpaths.
- The local adjoining roads do not have sufficient capacity (especially at rush hour) to take additional traffic that would be generated by this development.
• The approach to Potters Lane is not wide enough, bendy, and is on a gradient causing problems vehicles to pass safely without reversing around bends at times blind to other approaching vehicles.
• The school bus for George Abbott School operates along the road and is often observed struggling to pass vehicles parked on the road. This would be worse if this development was given the go-ahead.
• The land is currently regularly used local amenity where a number of footpaths meet, making it a desirable walking route.
• The subsoil of the proposed site contains documented unsafe landfill waste registered at GBC.
• This site is regularly monitored by permanent monitoring equipment. Surely by disturbing this site puts local residents health at risk by the unknown materials located in this landfill. Methane gas is one of the elements monitored regularly.
• To provide the proposed housing quantities the provision would not be in keeping with the surrounding area.
• The access to the site is not adequate for regular traffic and the potential volumes during construction and after construction.
• Such a high number of housing in an area with poor public transport and non-motorised user facilities increases the risk of vehicles accessing these properties being displaced parking on an already narrow Send Hill. This is issue would be further exacerbated at school times when school traffic parks solidly half way up Send Hill.
• Development in this location would impact on the local remaining countryside including nature reserve and waterway.
• Public transport is not sufficient meeting demand of potential additional passengers to encourage vehicles to be left at home to undertake local journeys.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5265  Respondent: 11032385 / Celia Guthrie  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill. The location is inappropriate because the only access is a narrow width single access country road. The road is too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site or accommodate increased levels of traffic. Send Hill already suffers from severe congestion, especially at school run time and would not cope with an increase in traffic volume. The development would spoil a high amenity area set in beautiful countryside and again erode the Green Belt. There would be significant impact on the nature reserve nearby.

The proposed development site A44 is registred by GBC as a landfill site not a quarry as listed as ref LLA 2081. As a landfill site it is not suitable for housing development for health reasons, any disturbance of the site would create a possible health hazard as material of the landfill is not known. Monitoring wells on site record methane gas discharge occurring.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1987  Respondent: 11032705 / Mike Tarrant  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object Policy A44. Winds Ridge and Send Hill

I object to this development because it was not include in the regulation 18 draft and has not been previously consulted upon.
It is on Green belt, permanently protected by NPPF to prevent the merging of settlements. There are no exceptional circumstances for taking this site out of the Green Belt.

The site contains documented unsafe landfill waste which is currently vented.

The site is also in a single track lane which is unsuitable for larger vehicle access, which the two traveller pitches would require.

The Lane is also the site of the Cemetery, a peaceful place to reflect and remember those who have gone before us.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3120  **Respondent:** 11033985 / John Peachey  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site A44 - I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe landfill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/592  **Respondent:** 11033985 / John Peachey  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site A44 - I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe landfill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2228  **Respondent:** 11034817 / Nick Pycraft  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposals for the development of 40 houses and 2 traveller’s pitches at Send Hill (Policy A44. 1.9 ha). The single track road would not be able to take the additional traffic, leading to potential gridlock. Send already suffers near gridlock in the mornings as vehicles travel through the village from the A3 to Woking and vice versa. This is also the case during the morning and afternoon school runs, with two schools in Send. This also raises the concern of safety for pupils and parents at these times.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4248</th>
<th>Respondent: 11036417 / Len Ozanne</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposed developments at Send Hill. The road is not capable of receiving any more traffic the end towards the Church is very dangerous and is not suitable for the school buses that have to use this currently. I do not like driving this section of the village and only do so in absolute necessity. Any development would increase risk to accidents and possible loss of life. This development will also increase the traffic problems at the traffic lights at Mays corner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1708</th>
<th>Respondent: 11036705 / Brian Slade</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the fact that POLICY A 444.1.9 ha LAND WEST OF WINDS RIDGE AND SEND HILL designated for 40 homes and 2 Travellers Pitches. This site is NEW and was NOT included in the Regulation 18 Draft and has not been consulted upon previously. Development for housing is inappropriate due to its permanent Green Belt status and it is a Green Belt amenity within an area of natural beauty which would be totally spoilt by any development. The site contains documented contaminated land which is vented. Also the site of the proposed Travellers Pitches can only be accessed via a narrow single track country road which makes access very limited and thus unsuitable for purpose.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7401</th>
<th>Respondent: 11037313 / Debbie Greener</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill. This is beautiful countryside you would be destroying &amp; the access on a small country road is insufficient to say the least.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4025</th>
<th>Respondent: 11040705 / Patricia Cullimore</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill. This is beautiful countryside you would be destroying &amp; the access on a small country road is insufficient to say the least.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT TO 40 HOUSES AND 2 TRAVELLERS’ PITCHES AT SEND HILL.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1595  Respondent: 11042369 / Huw Williams  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers’ pitches at Send Hill.

The only access to this site is a very narrow country lane, and is totally inadequate for the volume of traffic which would be generated by this proposal. There would be substantial impact on the residents of housing adjacent to Send Hill and the traffic problems referred to above would be added to by this proposal.

Please ensure that these objections are shown to the Planning Inspector who will be considering your draft Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4358  Respondent: 11043073 / Ingrid Botha  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill. It consists of particularly high quality Green Belt within an area of particularly beautiful countryside which would be destroyed by this development. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe landfill waste which is currently vented. The proposal for 2 travellers’ pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

I object to the fact that this site was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously. Full consultation is required.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1069  Respondent: 11043585 / Judith Chapman-Hatchett  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This is designated Green Belt and should not be developed, the woodland is one of the few areas left, that we can walk through and enjoy the Surrey Countryside locally.
Anecdotal evidence suggests this site has previously been a landfill site and not suited to the proposed development.

This is an excessive development, there is already significant traffic issues through Send, the road infrastructure in Send will be unable to cope with inevitable increased traffic. This is a wholesale destruction of the Green Belt in clear contravention of the Government’s stated commitment for Green Belt protection. This principle will also allow for the presumed further development of other Green Belt areas locally.

The development of Homes should be shared around the borough, not so focused around Ripley and Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1040  Respondent: 11045185 / Paul Chapman-Hatchett  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( No ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

This is designated Green Belt and should not be developed, the woodland is one of the few areas left, that we can walk through and enjoy the Surrey Countryside locally.

Anecdotal evidence suggests this site has previously been a landfill site and not suited to the proposed development.(reference Policy A44 on pages 124 and 225**)

There is already significant traffic issues through Send, the road infrastructure in Send will be unable to cope with increased traffic

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5422  Respondent: 11047169 / Margaret Sherborne  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object the development on houses and traveller’s pitches on Send Hill. The subsoil of the site contains documented unsafe landfill waste registered at GBC so this should eliminate this area for development with no other reason. As a caravan owner I am already aware of the narrow road with single width access and need to avoid certain times a day if we have our caravan in tow. It would be inappropriate to encourage more caravans to have to navigate it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4137  Respondent: 11047201 / Peter McGowan  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the development of 40 houses and two travellers' pitches at Send. It is an unsuitable location due to the narrow access road. The subsoil of the proposed site contains documented unsafe landfill waste registered at GBC. Development will ruin a high amenity area set in beautiful countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7258  Respondent: 11048481 / Patrick Oven  Agent:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to the proposed development of 40 houses at Send Hill together with a 2 pitch travellers' site. Again, this is Green Belt land, there are no "exceptional circumstances" to justify taking it out nor to allow development within it. It provides a useful and attractive area of open land between Send Hill and Potters Lane, which at this point, runs parallel to it. The land in question has been used as a dump in the distant past, and is littered with vent pipes. It is highly likely to be contaminated, given that its use for dumping predates more recent environmental legislation. Development here would be potentially hazardous to health. The road itself is very narrow, at the Potters Lane end especially so. It cannot take additional traffic, and certainly could not deal with Transit vans or even lorries towing large caravans. It is an utterly inappropriate area for such a site. I can only assume that whoever proposed this ludicrous idea has not visited the site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3555  Respondent: 11048769 / Peter Harmer  Agent:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the new development of 40 houses & 2 travellers’ pitches at Send Hill – unsuitable local access and the use of countryside for development purposes will only diminish the existing area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1749  Respondent: 11069601 / Barry Kiddell  Agent:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I Object to Policy A44.

It could never satisfy Policy S1.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The proposed development on Send Hill is within Site of Nature Conservation Interest and is Grade 2 (very good) agricultural land. Access roads leading to the site are already congested, and will be further congested if the proposed A3 entry and exit ramps at Burnt Common are implemented due to the large increase in traffic through the village. This site is not suitable for development.

I urge the council not to consider insetting Send from the Green Belt and set in motion future development of these spaces, but to focus on the numerous unused BROWNFIELD sites that exist throughout the Borough. These would more than meet the current housing demand, once this is properly defined within the Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
To summarise: health, environmental and ecological considerations are compelling on their own. The simple fact is that this development would result in homes that would be unfit for purpose. They would make no contribution to the community, as their only function would be to make life worse for all residents of Send Hill in particular, and Send in general.

I object to this development and ask that the application be rejected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4439  Respondent: 11096161 / Janice Perry  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill.

The narrow width single access road provides insufficient access and the subsoil of the proposed site contains unsafe landfill waste that has been documented and registered at the GBC. This high amenity area set in beautiful countryside is an inappropriate location for this proposed development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5865  Respondent: 11097409 / Neil Munro  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed Local plan, in particular the proposal for development of 40 dwellings and 2 traveller pitches, in Send Hill, Send.

The number of proposed dwellings is massively in excess of the level of development that the village can withstand and would totally change the nature of the village to the detriment of the existing residents.

As residents of [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998] my family would be directly impacted by the proposed development in Send Hill and I object for the following reasons.

- The proposed number of houses on the site is inappropriate for the size of the site.
- The increased traffic from the dwellings will overwhelm the road and the associated Junctions with impact on risk of accidents and delays
- The construction traffic to build the dwellings will cause major disruption and permanent damage to the road and environment including damage to trees and hedges from the large delivery vehicles.
- There are already major problems with the main sewer drainage from properties in Orchard Way and Send Hills which will be compounded by the introduction of 40 new dwellings.
- The area identified is Green Belt and this must be maintained for future generations.
• The number of dwellings proposed would not allow space for sufficient and realistic parking allocations for a rural housing location leading to parking in Send Hill which is already a problem and further adds to delays in traffic and accident risks.

• The inclusion of Traveller pitches will have a detrimental effect on the areas for the following reasons.

[Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it]

[Summary of redacted paragraph: Proposal has potential to result in social, economic and environmental impacts]

Where even a small number of pitch allocations have been provided it often leads to unofficial sites being set up locally and further travellers visit / locate to the area in an attempt to grow the provision and their community.

In these instances it has been seen that councils are either unwilling or unable to take enforcement action leaving it to residents groups to take action to resolve the issues.

The Send Hill cannot accommodate the transport of mobiles homes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3343</th>
<th>Respondent: 11097729 / Sheila Brown</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objections to Policy A44 the land west of Send Hill.

I object to the Green Belt area in Send being reduced in size or removed altogether. All Green Belt was supposed to be unchangeable by law. When it was set up originally, it was to control urban growth providing at the same time a 'lung' around London for the benefit of the people living in the capital. How can the air quality in London be improved if the Green Belt is gradually eroded with bricks and concrete?

I object to the number of houses being proposed ie 40. The site is not large enough. If you take the footprints of the 21 houses shown on one side of Send Hill only and put them on the area owned by the GBC they will not fit, and that is not even allowing for garden space!

I object to the inclusion of two Traveller pitches included on the site as being totally unsuitable both to Travellers and households sharing the site [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it]

I object to all the extra road traffic that such a project could bring to the village. Every household could have at least two cars and the congestion that that would cause on Send Hill and to the main Send Road, which is the only road to Woking, will bring chaos to an already overstretched system.

I object to the possible loss of a beauty spot which is only accessible at present by footpaths and which is enjoyed by people in the village and visitors.

I object to adding to the increase in the number of residents in the village (as there are other housing proposals throughout the village) because of the pressure on the already stretched medical and educational facilities in the village.

On the other hand a small development without Travellers pitches and in keeping with the surrounding properties could be a possibility.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7189</th>
<th>Respondent: 11100193 / Michael Turner</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to policy A44 Send Hill. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints. The proposed development is not sustainable because of poor infrastructure. Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site for travellers or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring. The site is a high quality green belt amenity area within beautiful surrounding countryside and would be spoilt by the development. A Wasteland Solutions environmental report on Send Hill dated March 2004 gave evidence of past ponding of water in the excavated area. Further development would disturb the water table and increase risk of flooding to surrounding properties. The site was used as a GBC registered landfill site and shown on the 1963-8 Ordnance Survey maps as “refuse and slag heap”. It is therefore unsuitable for such a development on health reasons. On the 1971 Ordnance Survey the site is shown as a “refuse tip” prior to when proper licensing/registration was required. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. I therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials. GBC has installed gas monitoring wells on site since July 2000. One well recording methane gas discharge and development of this site would be a health hazard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3035</th>
<th>Respondent: 11107105 / Michelle Manester</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a resident of Send Hill, I object to the proposal of building 40 houses and 2 traveller pitches at the end of my road. First and foremost the one car, single lane country lane at the end of my road is totally inappropriate and insufficient and does not provide sufficient access. I use the road daily at all times of the day and am 9 times out of ten forever reversing back up the road and squashing my car into bushes to allow a car to pass. The volume of traffic is at peak as it is, as much traffic comes off the A3 Slip Road down Send Hill. The increased flow of traffic would also have an adverse impact on street parking. Send Hill is already congested enough at school run times and is hard enough trying to get through the road both ends! The proposed site also contains unsafe landfill waste and it would impact significantly on the nature reverse. Not to mention the impact on local services - you can't even get a same day appointment as it is at the Doctor's surgery!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6689</th>
<th>Respondent: 11136993 / Elliot Machin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Send Hill is a very narrow country lane, unsuitable for travellers large vehicles. Subsoil of the proposed site contains documented unsafe landfill waste.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2919  Respondent: 11152161 / Alan Sparkes  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the site is not large enough to the proposed use.

1. I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that it would cause adverse impact on street parking.

1. I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.
I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that send is in green belt. The proposed inset is inappropriate due to its permanent green belt status.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that Send Hill is a narrow road result in loss of a turning point for vehicles.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that it would impact the nature reserve nearby. The proposed site is a quality green belt amenity area within countryside and would be spoilt by development.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the existing road and parking infrastructure is already inadequate or under pressure and could worsen with the planned development, reducing quality of life.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that too many houses are proposed to Send/Send Marsh are and the impact on traffic congestion and local services would be unacceptable.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the proposed number of houses potentially could result in 92 extra cars in Send Hill which is already suffering from congestion particularly at school run time.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that this would cause loss of village identity, be detrimental to the community and increased flood risk.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that a Wasteland Solutions environmental report on Send Hill dated March 2004 gave evidence of past ponding of water in the excavated area. Further development would disturb water table and increase risk of flooding to my property.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the proposed development site (A44) was used as GBC registered landfill site, not a quarry as listed as reference LLA 2081 in the local plan.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the 1963-8 Ordnance Survey maps of proposed site mark it as "refuse and sag heap". It is therefore unsuitable for such a development on health reasons. I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the 1971 Ordnance Survey maps of proposed site mark it as "refuse tip" prior to when proper licensing/registration was required. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU landfill Directive regulations. I therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials.

GBC has installed gas monitoring wells on site since July 2000. One well recording methane gas discharge.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the rounds that a Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN-HCP dated 5 January 2005-Identifies the proposed site as GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/11/LLC with type of waste not identified. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. I therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that a Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN-HCP dated 5th January 2005-Identifies proposed site GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/12 with type of waste identified as "unrestricted2. This causes me concern as to what it does contain and dangers if disturbed .

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the rounds that both the Envirosearch Report RS 1100201-1-1 dated 1 h February 2004 and historical map data and information from GBC has identified site as landfill and has "areas of potentially contaminative industrial activities". Development of this site would be a health hazard . The recent news reports of a child dying from seepage of contaminated ground following flooding prove that developing any such sites is a danger to health. The Daily Mail has also recently had an article on how dangers of living near landfill site raises cancer concerns. The paper referenced a study published by the international journey of Epidemiology which tracked 242,000 people living near landfill sites in Italy.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that both the Envirosearch Report RS 110001-1-1 dated 17th February 2004 identifies "potential risk from landfill gas migrations"which I believe is a health hazard.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that both Envirosearch Report RS 1100201-1-1 dated 17111 February 2004 Concludes "potentially contaminative industrial sites identified from analysis" of Ordnance survey maps.
I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN-HCP dated 5 January 2005 Identifies proposed site as a local authorized landfill site as licences under Part 11 of Environmental protection Act 1990. The proposed site is not a quarry as specified in The GBC Local Plan. Therefore not suitable for the proposed usage.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN-HCP dated 5 January 2005 Identifies proposed site as potentially contaminative industrial land. With usage of "Heap and unknown constituents". This causes me concern as to what it does contain and dangers if disturbed.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN-HCP 5th January 2005 Identifies changes to proposed site could cause potential ground water vulnerability to my property.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the Traveller Accommodation Assessment research, purported to have been undertaken in June-July 2012 by Mill Field Services, cannot be so. The Sittingbourne based market research company was dissolved in January 2011 according to the government companies site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5582  Respondent: 11941665 / Debra Hurdle  Agent: 11941665 / Debra Hurdle

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object – This land in Send Hill is another Green Belt site and this wildlife area should be protected and not developed. It is also off a lane which is single track in places and it has a very dangerous junction at one end.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1482  Respondent: 12124385 / P Davie  Agent: 12124385 / P Davie

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3. Specific Sites

1. Send Hill (site no. A44)

2. Site Access: I OBJECT since this development will increase traffic along Send Hill. This is a very narrow road (or lane) that, for one third of its length, permits only single file traffic. Any increase in traffic volumes must increase the risk of accidents. I have already witnessed several occasions where two cars only just missed hitting each other (i.e. coming head to head). I personally avoid using this road due to the perceived risk of a serious accident. In addition the junction between Send Hill and Potters Lane is hazardous, due to poor sight lines, with numerous accidents observed.

3. Flooding: I OBJECT since part of the site comprises a bowl formation that has flooded most winters for many years. This, together with a large pond on adjacent land, indicates a high water table in this area. Any disturbance to the site would possibly alter the water table thus causing flooding to adjacent properties.

4. Site Contamination: I OBJECT since Guildford Borough Council used the site as a refuse tip/landfill site for many years. The site is therefore unsuitable for development on health grounds.
5. Site Over development: **I OBJECT** since the site is too small for the proposed uses.

6. Outside current development boundary: **I OBJECT** since this development lies outside the existing housing outline of the village, and should therefore be refused to avoid both loss of green belt land and creeping development between Send, Woking, and Guildford.

7. Increased demand on village services: **I OBJECT** since this proposed development will add additional houses to the existing village stock, thereby increasing demands on existing village services, e.g. schools and health services. These are already recognised as being oversubscribed. Any development, which further increases demand, must be deferred until after additional investment by the Borough/County has increased their capacities.

8. Loss of amenity: **I OBJECT** since the site has been used as a public open space for many, many years. It is understood the timescale is such as to confer the formal status and protection of Public Open Space status to the site, which then prohibits development.

9. Loss of amenity: **I OBJECT** since the site is part of the rural nature of this part of Send. Adding houses, and associated access/service roads, will detract from this setting, be visible for long distances, and will adversely alter the character of the area. In particular scenic views to and from the River Way and St Mary’s Church will be adversely impacted.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5934</th>
<th>Respondent: 12210849 / Jason Doran</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I also completely object to the creation of a Traveller Site on Send Hill. This would be [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature] (unless you built a Police Station on the same site!). The area in question is regularly used as open space for children to play in (off the road and out of their houses) and is also used by Dog walkers and local people who want to enjoy the outdoors. [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature] There are any number of more suitable places for a traveller site, for instance next to some of the industrial areas or Social housing.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/21</th>
<th>Respondent: 15062113 / Christine Acock</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With reference to the new proposals for two Traveller's sites in Send Hill, I would like to raise the following objections:

1. Having lived alongside Travellers in Berkshire, I witnessed their lifestyle and culture first hand and therefore believe that Traveller’s lifestyle is particularly **culturally diverse** to that of existing Send Hill residents. When considering culture, ethnicity and diversity, it is important to not only consider the rights of minority groups such as Travellers, but also the **rights of existing residents**, in regard to their chosen way of life and culture.

2. The road already has very **poor infrastructure** and is single file traffic alongside the proposed site. The only way the Local Authority could resolve this issue, would be to widen the road and lose the charm that this area of the road affords. I have also noticed that drivers regularly travel too fast in the road and it is only when cars approach from the opposite direction, that traffic is caused to naturally slow as the road narrows. This will also
be a concern, if too many additional homes are planned for the road. The infrastructure of the single track road is already exacerbated at times during the rush hour.

1. As so much school traffic uses the road, plus many other daily users who enjoy the walks around this area, it is important for any planning decision to take into account the safety and wellbeing of road users in Send Hill and give consideration to the size of vehicles typically used on a Traveller’s Site.

1. Residents of Send Hill are predominantly middle aged and live quiet, peaceful lives in the main. They are entitled to retain their chosen culture.

1. Travellers that settle are no longer travellers technically and therefore should not be automatically be entitled to the special privileges their culture affords.

1. Send Hill is currently an area of beauty, where many walkers come to enjoy the pleasant outlook in the area under consideration as a Traveller site. I believe we have a legacy to retain this landscape and the walks around it, so that future generations can also enjoy it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 Travellers' pitches at Send Hill. It is an inappropriate location because the narrow width, single access country road provides insufficient access. The subsoil of the proposed site contains documented unsafe landfill waste registered at GBC. Any development of this site would spoil a high amenity area set in beautiful countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8  
Respondent: 15063553 / Keith Harrington  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to register my objection to the above plan. Development for housing is inappropriate due to its permanent Green Belt status. The sub soil of the site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

I therefore object to this proposal. Please ensure my comments are seen by the inspector.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/9  
Respondent: 15064481 / Colin and Sue Henderson  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Thirdly, I object to the proposed development at the Send Hill site. This again is a new development as well as including a site for Travellers - totally out of keeping.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/42  
Respondent: 15064673 / Steven Yadav  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the above propose plan to build 40 homes and two Travellers Pitches.

This site is NEW and was NOT included in the regulation 18 draft and has NOT consulted upon previously.

The development for housing is inappropriate due to its permanent GREEN BELT status and high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside, which would be completely be spoilt by an development.

The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented.
The proposed to include two Travellers Pitches is inappropriate due to the very narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

So with my above comments I would like to say I STURDILY OBJECT

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/15  Respondent: 15067425 / Anita Fairbairn  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?  

I object to this proposal. This site is new and was not included in the regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously. Development for housing is inappropriate due to its permanent Green Belt status and high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt by any development. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers pitched is inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/23  Respondent: 15068737 / Angela Blaydon  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?  

I object to the 1.9 ha of land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill being built upon as this is also a new proposal and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft. It has not been consulted upon previously. This land has green belt status and any development would be detrimental to the area. The land in this area was once land fill waste and the subsoil is therefore unsafe for building upon, apart from the fact that it is serviced by a narrow width single track country road.

I further object on the grounds that there seems to be no thought given to local infrastructure to cope with the proposals.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/28  Respondent: 15080865 / Adar Sinai  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?  

Finally we also object to policy A44 West Ridge and Send hill.Again this site is new, not included in the regulation 18 draft and not previously consulted on. This is high quality Green Belt land. The subsoil of the site contains documented land fill waste and is vented, making it totally unsuitable for development. Access is completely insufficient.

Please reject these proposals they are unwanted, unnecessary and have zero local support.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to record my objection to the planned local development A44.19ha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I live locally in [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998] and my mother lives on Send Hill, i moved locally so i can look after my mother as she gets older - we moved to Send a few years ago as it is surrounded by a lot of greenbelt which is perfect for walks and running.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We purchased both properties after carefully selecting the area as village life is important, we did not expect a mass of houses to be built right behind my mothers property and certainly do not approve of 'Travellors' being GIFTED land - we have both worked hard and paid a LOT in taxes over many years, [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it] I feel by allowing this plan to proceed you will place undue stress, fear which would be detrimental to my mothers health.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is plenty of land far more suitable near the 'Eubanks' auction house between the A3 and the slip road from the A3 towards Send.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surely you can see the proposed plot A44 is not suitable or fair and therefore i strongly OBJECT to this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A44. 1.9 ha Land west of Winds Ridge and Send hill being designated for 40 homes and 2 travellers pitches. This site is new and was not included in the regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously. Again, this is green belt and needs protecting. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site and widening this would be destroying our countryside further.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/35</th>
<th>Respondent: 15081441 / Mary Conisbee</th>
<th>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Sirs

I object to the planning development to the Green Belt status being eroded away, from Send Village, Send Hill Site, it outrageous to put 40 houses and 2 travellers pitch sites, this is a new site and was not included in the regulation 18 draft and not been consulted upon previously.

Send Hill is a quite very narrow single track lane, peaceful, within beautiful countryside, it is also in permanent Green Belt status, so is totally inappropriate to increase the traffic flow, the junction where it meets Potters Lane is very dangerous indeed, as you cannot see on coming traffic coming round the bend at all, and would cause many accidents.

There are any number of brown fill land site in the borough on which to build, without destroying the precious Green Belt.

The infrastructure of the village cannot cope with the current populations requirements, one cannot get a doctors appointment, the schools, traffic congestion etc are all under pressure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I strongly object to the above propose plan to build 40 homes and two Travellers Pitches.

This site is NEW and was NOT included in the regulation 18 draft and has NOT consulted upon previously.

The development for housing is inappropriate due to its permanent GREEN BELT status and high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside, which would be completely be spoilt by an development.

The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented.

The proposed to include two Travellers Pitches is inappropriate due to the very narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

So with my above comments I would like to say I STURDILY OBJECT

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
amended to cover the increase of 40 houses without major investment and disruption as it is a narrow single track country road. The subsoil of this site is documented to contain unsafe landfill waste which is currently vented.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/45  Respondent: 15082049 / Antony Marke  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A44. 1.9 ha Land west of Winds Ridge and Send hill being designated for 40 homes and 2 travellers pitches. This site is new and was not included in the regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously. Again, this is green belt and needs protecting. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site and widening this would be destroying our countryside further.

There is no need to be destroying our beautiful countryside and endangering ancient trees, local wildlife and the existing quality of life for current residents. Green Belt is Green Belt for a reason, please respect that.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/47  Respondent: 15082657 / Mark Gibbs  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to POLICY A44. 1.9ha LAND WEST OF WINDS RIDGE AND SEND HILL for the reasons listed below.

1. Our children would feel unsafe [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equality Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it]
2. At the bottom of Send Hill is a school, with the extra traffic this would become a potential danger zone to the children of the school and the local community.
3. Crime would potentially soar in the village putting extra burden on the already overstretched public services, for instance, the police, hospital/ambulance service and the fire station.
4. We would not feel safe in our own homes anymore.
5. [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature]
6. Send Hill has a small road that is restrictive at the best of times and with the additional flow of traffic and the current infrastructure this would put heavy strain on this area
7. [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equality Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.]
   [Summary of redacted paragraph: proposal has the potential to increase tension between the traveller and non-traveller community, which would result in social, economic and environmental impacts]
8. This site is a land fill site and has unknown waste buried underneath it, digging this up would raise health and safety concerns within the Send community.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2217  **Respondent:** 15084897 / Save Send Action Group (Andrew Procter)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

44.1 **POLICY A44 SEND HILL**

44.2 I object to policy A44 Send Hill

44.3 There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

44.4 The proposed development is not sustainable because of poor infrastructure. Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site for travellers or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.

44.5 The site is a high quality green belt amenity area within beautiful surrounding countryside and would be spoilt by the development.

44.6 A Wasteland Solutions environmental report on Send Hill dated March 2004 gave evidence of past ponding of water in the excavated area. Further development would disturb the water table and increase risk of flooding to surrounding properties.

44.7 The site was used as a GBC registered landfill site and shown on the 1963-8 Ordnance Survey maps as “refuse and slag heap”. It is therefore unsuitable for such a development on health reasons.

44.8 On the 1971 Ordnance Survey the site is shown as a “refuse tip” prior to when proper licensing/registration was required. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. I therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials.

44.9 GBC has installed gas monitoring wells on site since July 2000. One well recording methane gas discharge.

44.10 A Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005 Identifies proposed site GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/12 with type of waste identified as “unrestricted”. This causes concern as to what it does contain and the dangers if disturbed.

44.11 An Envirosarch Report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004 and historical map data and information from GBC has identified the site as landfill and has “areas of potentially contaminative industrial activities” and “potential risk from landfill gas migrations”. Development of this site would be a health hazard.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/53  **Respondent:** 15085793 / Deborah Ellis  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
OBJECTION TO SEND HILL DEVELOPMENT - POLICY A44, 1.9 - LAND WEST OF WINDS RIDGE & SEND HILL - LATE STAGE APPLICATION WITHOUT ANY PRIOR CONSULTATION

I strongly object to the above proposed planning development by eroding Send's Green Belt status on the above site.

I object to your proposal to allow 40 houses and 2 travellers pitch sites, this being a newly designated site and not included in the regulation 18 draft. Therefore correct procedure has not been carried out by yourselves.

Send Hill is obviously a narrow single track lane, having managed to retain it's peaceful, beautiful countryside, currently enjoyed by all residents and dog walkers from other areas. For this reason it has permanent Green Belt status.

It is totally inappropriate to increase the traffic flow. The junction where it meets Potters Lane is very dangerous and residents have suffered accidents as a result of being unable to see any oncoming traffic. I rely on sound alone when pulling out and have narrowly avoided head on collisions in the past and therefore also make my objection on the grounds of safely.

Send's infrastructure cannot cope with the current population, the problems with doctor's appointments, school places and traffic are consistent. The Council would be well advised to ensure that it provides acceptable standards of living for the current residents before irresponsibly placing further stress on the living conditions of it's current council tax payers.

Please confirm receipt of this letter and advise the Council's statutory requirements regarding proposed planning consultations.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/55  Respondent: 15086017 / Shuli Sinai  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Finally we also object to policy A44 West Ridge and Send hill. Again this site is new, not included in the regulation 18 draft and not previously consulted on. This is high quality Green Belt land. The subsoil of the site contains documented land fill waste and is vented, making it totally unsuitable for development. Access is completely insufficient. Please reject these proposals they are unwanted, unnecessary and have zero local support.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1620  Respondent: 15086017 / Shuli Sinai  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4227</th>
<th>Respondent: 15098945 / ALISON TURNER</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Policy A44. Land West of Winds Ridge and Send Hill- I am horrified to see this included in the plan.
   1. It's NOT included in the regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted upon previously.
   2. Housing development is not lawful due to this area's permanent Green Belt status and high quality countryside which is much loved by dog walkers, children and local wildlife.
   3. The narrow width single track lane cannot cope with HGV lorries and vans and particularly will not provide access for mobile homes uni. This lane is very much appreciated by local residents.
   4. Send Hill, by its nature, provides a much loved country environment, it would be a catastrophe if Guildford Borough Council decide to wipe this out by placing traveler pitches and housing in this area.
   5. The proposed change to this recreational area will damage local wildlife including owls, pheasants, deer, geese, foxes and birds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/65</th>
<th>Respondent: 15099489 / Christine Vinten</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Under Policy A44 you are proposing 40 new homes and 2 traveller pitches. I object to this on the following grounds; this site is new and was not included in the Reg 18 draft so has not been consulted on previously, the land is Green Belt and not appropriate for housing development and the subsoil of the site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/69</th>
<th>Respondent: 15099681 / David Strudwick</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I also object to the development of the land in Send Hill. This is the most inappropriate location for extra housing. Send Hill is a narrow residential road most unsuited to extra development. The road is used by local children to walk to school or to the bus stop for the George Abbott School bus. Being a straight road with no pavements extra traffic would put children at risk. The proposed site is vented landfill and as such I would think entirely unsuited to housing development.

Send Hill is home to one or more colonies of bats. Future development would put these protected species at risk.
Development of Send Hill was not in the council’s draft and has not been consulted upon. It should be removed from the Local Plan on this alone.

The residents of Surry are continually bombarded by the council’s cynical and sometimes underhand attempts to undermine the standard of living in this beautiful county. I lived in Knaphill where Farmland was destroyed to build housing at Brookwood farm. At the same time Surry County Council published adverts championing the council’s obligation to protect farm land. We are faced with the same thing now in Send. Green belt land is for a reason and it is time that the council took notice of it and stood to protect it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/71  **Respondent:** 15099745 / Duncan Vinten  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Under Policy A44 you are proposing 40 new homes and 2 traveller pitches. I object to this on the following grounds; this site is new and was not included in the Reg 18 draft so has not been consulted on previously, the land is Green Belt and not appropriate for housing development and the subsoil of the site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/75  **Respondent:** 15100385 / Emma Gibbs  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. **strongly object** to POLICY A44. 1.9ha LAND WEST OF WINDS RIDGE AND SEND HILL for the reasons listed below.

   1. Our children would feel unsafe [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it]
   2. At the bottom of Send Hill is a school, with the extra traffic this would become a potential danger zone to the children of the school and the local community.
   3. Crime would potentially soar in the village putting extra burden on the already overstretched public services, for instance, the police, hospital/ambulance service and the fire station.
   4. We would not feel safe in our own homes anymore.
   5. [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature]
   6. Send Hill has a small road that is restrictive at the best of times and with the additional flow of traffic and the current infrastructure this would put heavy strain on this area
   7. [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.]

   [Summary of redacted paragraph: proposal has the potential to increase tension between the traveller and non-traveller community, which would result in social, economic and environmental impacts]
8. This site is a land fill site and has unknown waste buried underneath it, digging this up would raise health and safety concerns within the Send community.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/88  Respondent: 15102209 / Martin Manktelow  Agent:

Policy A44 Land to the west of Winds ridge and Send Hill

It is proposed to build forty houses and two traveller pitches.

This land is predominantly an infilled sand and gravel pit. It was filled over several years and still has venting points. The land is now partly farmed and grazed. It is a beautiful site which affords distant view from Potters Lane, Send. These lovely views would be totally altered. From the Send Hill side footpath there are distant views of the Surrey Hills. It probably represents backland development.

Send Hill is a very narrow lane and access to a small estate would be unsuitable. The site is not a sensible place for traveller pitches either as the access would be even worse for long vehicles. It is a mile from the village shops and bus stops.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/97  Respondent: 15105089 / Theresa McKeague  Agent:

I object to the building of houses on what was a landfill site.
I object because I paid high price for my property to have an open aspect overlooking green belt land.
I object because it will devalue my property
I object to having traveller pitches in a well established good residential area.
I object because of increased traffic on a narrow road with no footpaths and limited lighting.
I object because of the increased population where the gp surgery and local schools are already stretched to the limit.
I object because I feel that the Un - necessary use of green belt land where there are brown sites that should be used.
I object because this site is new and was not included in the regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6569  Respondent: 15106593 / Louise Clark  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill. Disturbance of the documented 'unsafe' landfill waste within the subsoil (registered at Guildford B C) is an environmental hazard. Again, the area has outstanding beauty and is wholly unsuitable for development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/107  Respondent: 15106881 / Sarai Sinai  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44 
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Finally we also object to policy A44 West Ridge and Send hill. Again this site is new, not included in the regulation 18 draft and not previously consulted on. This is high quality Green Belt land. The subsoil of the site contains documented land fill waste and is vented, making it totally unsuitable for development. Access is completely insufficient.

Please reject these proposals they are unwanted, unnecessary and have zero local support.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/115  Respondent: 15109121 / Larry Bottomley  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44 
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A44, 1.9 ha Land West Ridge and Send Hill.

This is a new proposal and certainly if it had been proposed earlier then concerns on building on a previous land fill waste site could have been investigated. There are currently vents in place on this site which may be a health and insurance concern for those that live in houses built on this site.

Do note that Send Hill is a very narrow road especially where it meets Potters Lane, where it is single width and very steep lane leading on to a blind corner. The increase in traffic from an additional 40 houses and 2 travellers’ sites would make this junction busier and therefore more dangerous.

Without consideration of the safety of building on the land fill or the traffic safety on Send Hill, I object to policy A44.

Please feel free to contact me at the e-mail address above if any of this reasoning requires further clarification.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1932  Respondent: 15127809 / A W Baker  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A44 
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Response to changes in the local plan affecting site A44 -
Land to the West of Winds Ridge.

I live opposite the proposed development site and have done so since 2003. This piece of green belt provides considerable amenity for those seeking refreshment, opportunities to exercise themselves and many dogs during the course of the day. Many runners and walkers, some very elderly currently use Send Hill as a quiet place to exercise during the day in spite of the lack of pedestrian facilities. Send Hill is a narrow country road beyond the cemetery and traffic already builds up in the school rush hours with heavy parking related congestion during those times, especially near the schools at the north end.

Whenever there are traffic flow problems northbound on the A3 people with local knowledge will use Potters Lane and Send Hill as a diversion to bypass the problem. Traffic volumes will increase considerably at those times.

The parish council also note that the users of the cemetery, both for multi-denominational funerals as well as regular visitors will be adversely affected by the inevitable increase in traffic and noise of passing vehicles.

The school bus and HGVs accessing Send Hill via Potters Lane are often seen to have difficulties in negotiating this narrow road especially in attempting to pass each other in opposite directions – which is often hard enough for two or more cars.

There is little scope for improving the infrastructure. There is no public transport available and the road to the village may prove to be unduly hazardous to pedestrian families with young children who may be tempted to buy affordable houses on low incomes while affording one or two family cars to add to the congestion. It is well over 1.5 miles to the shops, such as they are, and the GP health centre and pharmacy are as far again in the opposite direction along Send Barns Lane. There is a public footpath which connects to the recreation area but with cuts in council expenditure the maintenance is wanting and in poor weather the path becomes unsuitable.

The proposal to build 40 affordable houses at A44 suggest an intensity of development in a poorly resourced area which the Parish Council has deemed unsuitable for this level of development on several grounds including the failure of the proposing Council to supply evidence of need objectively. The council is bound to take a view on the impact on the environment as well as aspects of community welfare on a range of issues.

The land which is owned by the council at this point is a former landfill site and it is known that a range of asbestos products have been dumped towards the end of the site’s usage. It seems to me to be unnecessary to add to risk of contamination during any development work and the council has not addressed this issue as far as I know. Dealing with such a risk would increase costs and may render the whole project unaffordable!

Provision for two Traveller sites.

This proposal includes the facility to keep large fairground machinery and transport vehicles on the site with the implication that this will become a major feature of the new landscape. We see that other traveller sites are proposed in the local area and it would be interesting to know if the travelling community has been consulted about their preference to have sites close to each other rather than separated in this way.

In historical terms, there is a piece of land in excess of one acre at the north end of A44 which is owned by a Gypsy family who attempted to gain access across the land owned by the Council. They were evicted as the council did not approve of such use of the land. A large ditch was dug to prevent further intrusion and the wooded area left unused. It is understood that the current owner who lives in W. Sussex does not support this proposed use of land adjacent to hers.

Our view is that such a proposal would bring about such a fundamental change in the environment and bring an unwanted impact on the current settled community simply because of the nature of what is proposed.

In summary – we object to all the provisions proposed in the allocation for A44 and we support the position of the parish council who have determined that such an allocation is un-necessary and that the land identified is unsuitable for such an intensive development because of infrastructural deficiencies, lack of amenity to support such an explosion of population in a small part of the parish. It would also impact on the current usage which so many people enjoy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Response to changes in the local plan affecting site A44 -

Land to the West of Winds Ridge.

I live opposite the proposed development site and have done so since 2003. This piece of green belt provides considerable amenity for those seeking refreshment, opportunities to exercise themselves and many dogs during the course of the day. Many runners and walkers, some very elderly currently use Send Hill as a quiet place to exercise during the day in spite of the lack of pedestrian facilities. Send Hill is a narrow country road beyond the cemetery and traffic already builds up in the school rush hours with heavy parking related congestion during those times, especially near the schools at the north end.

Whenever there are traffic flow problems northbound on the A3 people with local knowledge will use Potters Lane and Send Hill as a diversion to bypass the problem. Traffic volumes will increase considerably at those times.

The parish council also note that the users of the cemetery, both for multi-denominational funerals as well as regular visitors will be adversely affected by the inevitable increase in traffic and noise of passing vehicles.

The school bus and HGVs accessing Send Hill via Potters Lane are often seen to have difficulties in negotiating this narrow road especially in attempting to pass each other in opposite directions – which is often hard enough for two or more cars.

There is little scope for improving the infrastructure. There is no public transport available and the road to the village may prove to be unduly hazardous to pedestrian families with young children who may be tempted to buy affordable houses on low incomes while affording one or two family cars to add to the congestion. It is well over 1.5 miles to the shops, such as they are, and the GP health centre and pharmacy are as far again in the opposite direction along Send Barns Lane. There is a public footpath which connects to the recreation area but with cuts in council expenditure the maintenance is wanting and in poor weather the path becomes unsuitable.

The proposal to build 40 affordable houses at A44 suggest an intensity of development in a poorly resourced area which the Parish Council has deemed unsuitable for this level of development on several grounds including the failure of the proposing Council to supply evidence of need objectively. The council is bound to take a view on the impact on the environment as well as aspects of community welfare on a range of issues.

The land which is owned by the council at this point is a former landfill site and it is known that a range of asbestos products have been dumped towards the end of the site’s usage. It seems to me to be unnecessary to add to risk of contamination during any development work and the council has not addressed this issue as far as I know. Dealing with such a risk would increase costs and may render the whole project unaffordable!

Provision for two Traveller sites.

This proposal includes the facility to keep large fairground machinery and transport vehicles on the site with the implication that this will become a major feature of the new landscape. We see that other traveller sites are proposed in the local area and it would be interesting to know if the travelling community has been consulted about their preference to have sites close to each other rather than separated in this way.

In historical terms, there is a piece of land in excess of one acre at the north end of A44 which is owned by a Gypsy family who attempted to gain access across the land owned by the Council. They were evicted as the council did not approve of such use of the land. A large ditch was dug to prevent further intrusion and the wooded area left unused. It is understood that the current owner who lives in W. Sussex does not support this proposed use of land adjacent to hers.

Our view is that such a proposal would bring about such a fundamental change in the environment and bring an unwanted impact on the current settled community simply because of the nature of what is proposed.

In summary – we object to all the provisions proposed in the allocation for A44 and we support the position of the parish council who have determined that such an allocation is un-necessary and that the land identified is unsuitable for such an
intensive development because of infrastructural deficiencies, lack of amenity to support such an explosion of population in a small part of the parish. It would also impact on the current usage which so many people enjoy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/174  Respondent: 15132129 / Carolyn Harrington  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to register my objection to the above plan. Development for housing is inappropriate due to its permanent Green Belt status. The sub soil of the site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

I therefore object to this proposal. Please ensure my comments are seen by the inspector.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/191  Respondent: 15136929 / Richard Davis  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to object to the Final Draft Local Plan and wish my comments to be seen by the Inspector.

Policy A44. 1.9 ha Land West of Winds Ridge and Send Hill designated for 40 homes and two Travellers Pitches

I object because:
- the site was not included in the regulation 18 draft and the site has not been consulted on previously;
- development for housing is inappropriate on this land which has Green Belt status. The land is currently used by myself and others for walking in a natural green environment;
- access to the site is limited due to the width of Send Hill road, single track from the proposed site entrance to its junction with Potters Lane and narrow throughout its length, with no pavement for pedestrians for most of its length;
- the number of (2) travellers pitches is out of proportion to the number of houses proposed (40)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7296  Respondent: 15138433 / Sylvia Pyne  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to Policy A44 at Winds Ridge and Send Hill. The history of using this site for landfill waste makes it unsuitable for housing, and again Send Hill is too narrow a road to accept significant extra traffic. In particular – and again I speak from experience, having lived in Send for over 30 years – the junction of Send Hill with Potters Lane is very dangerous. Send Hill is very narrow and twisty at that point and has a steep gradient. On many occasions I have met vehicles coming in the other direction and one of us has had to reverse to allow the other to pass. Turning right from Send Hill into Potters Lane is particularly hazardous as both roads have no speed limit and cars tend to drive fast along Potters Lane even when approaching the poorly signposted concealed junction. Travellers' vehicles turning into or out of Send Hill at that junction would exacerbate the danger, and if any such vehicle were of great length, safely manoeuvring it would be problematic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5412  Respondent: 15143681 / Mark Clover  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The other sites on Send Hill and Winds Ridge are on single track rural roads, again not consulted upon, some of which is landfill with vents visible above the ground. These are country roads, quite and peaceful places and not suitable for the kind of development that is being proposed!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/253  Respondent: 15144161 / Karen Patterson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to policy A44 which would see 40 homes and two travellers' pitches on land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill. This was again a NEW site NOT included in 18 draft and therefore has NOT been consulted on previously. Once again this is Green Belt land partly containing unsafe landfill. Access is by a narrow lane which could never take the volume of traffic that would ensue from traveller's pitches.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/257  Respondent: 15144929 / Michael Simpson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

> I object to the local plan policy A44.1.9 proposal to allow a travellers site anywhere in Send and especially where there is insufficient access for their larger vehicles.
>
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/303  Respondent: 15146049 / Ian Tulloch  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

With reference Policy A44 (Land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill) in the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites June 2016

I object to the inclusion of this site because it is NEW and was not included in the regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted upon previously.

I object because its development for housing is inappropriate owing to its permanent Green Belt status.

I object on Health and Safely grounds since the subsoil of the existing landfill site contains documented unsafe landfill waste which is currently vented and monitored. Any disturbance of this waste for housing development gives rise to environmental risks (methane gas, asbestos etc).

I object to the siting of the development because the narrow width single track country road (with no pavement) provides insufficient access, particularly with the expected increase in traffic.

I object to the adverse impact on the tranquillity of the recently enlarged cemetery.

I object to the loss of wildlife habitat as the site is home to many species of bird, reptile and insect.

I object to the adverse impact on the character of the village as a desirable, pleasant place to live.

I wish my objections to be brought to the attention of the Government’s Planning Inspector.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2344  Respondent: 15146049 / Ian Tulloch  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**OBJECTIONS TO THE LOCAL PLAN**

With reference Policy A44 (Land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill) in the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites June 2016

I object to the inclusion of this site because it is NEW and was not included in the regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted upon previously.

I object because its development for housing is inappropriate owing to its permanent Green Belt status. The Green Belt was originally proposed in 1935 to ensure space between villages and not turn into an urban sprawl. No one has the right to take this away from us - once its gone its gone for ever which will have a huge impact for our future generations.

I object on Health and Safely grounds since the subsoil of the existing landfill site contains documented unsafe landfill waste which is currently vented and monitored. Any disturbance of this waste for housing development gives rise to environmental risks (methane gas, asbestos etc). When purchasing our home in 2010 our Environmental Survey reported...
issues with regards to the landfill site - we experienced lengthy delays while consulting with Guildford Borough Council over this matter.

I object to the siting of the development because the narrow width single track country road (with no pavement) provides insufficient access, particularly with the expected increase in traffic. The road already gets blocked due to the school at the end of the road twice a day.

I object to the adverse impact on the tranquillity of the recently enlarged cemetery.

I object to the loss of wildlife habitat as the site is home to many species of bird, reptile and insect.

I object to the adverse impact on the character of the village as a desirable, pleasant place to live. The proposal to build over 400 houses will have a huge impact on the local schools, doctors and transport.

I wish my objections to be brought to the attention of the Government's Planning Inspector.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1104  Respondent: 15146529 / D C Ellis  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to your proposal to allow 40 houses and 2 travellers pitch sites, this being a newly designated site and not included in the regulation 18 draft. Therefore correct procedure has not been carried out by yourselves.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/713  Respondent: 15146945 / E J M Symonds  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I also object most strongly to the other last minute plan to build 40 new homes with 2 travellers sites at Send Hill. This is a totally unsuitable area on what was once a landfill site with vents in the ground. Send Hill is a small country lane with no pavements and lived in by many elderly people.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/717  Respondent: 15146945 / E J M Symonds  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The site is on Green Belt on Green Belt which is permanently protected by the NPPF.
Please this time listen to the residents of Send. Surely after the last meeting at the Lancaster Hall which was filled to capacity our concerns must be obvious.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/313  Respondent: 15154177 / Rebecca Giordanengo  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to record my objection to the planned local development A44.19ha

I live locally in [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998] and my mother in law lives on Send Hill, i moved locally so i can look after my mother in law as she gets older - we moved to Send a few years ago as it is surrounded by a lot of greenbelt which is perfect for walks and running.

We purchased both properties after carefully selecting the area as village life is important, we did not expect a mass of houses to be built right behind my mothers property and certainly do not approve of 'Travellors' being GIFTED land - we have both worked hard and paid a LOT in taxes over many years, [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it] I feel by allowing this plan to proceed you will place undue stress, fear which would be detrimental to my mothers health.

There is plenty of land far more suitable near the 'Eubanks' auction house between the A3 and the slip road from the A3 towards Send.

Surely you can see the proposed plot A44 is not suitable or fair and therefore i strongly OBJECT to this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/320  Respondent: 15154465 / Glen Harrington  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to register my objection to the above plan. Development for housing is inappropriate due to its permanent Green Belt status. The sub soil of the site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

I therefore object to this proposal. Please ensure my comments are seen by the inspector.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/321  Respondent: 15154593 / Linda Davis  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
I object because:

- the site was not included in the regulation 18 draft and the site has not been consulted on previously;

- development for housing is inappropriate on this land which has Green Belt status. This land is currently used daily by myself and others for walking in a natural green environment and which would be spoilt by any development. The subsoil of this land contains documented unsafe landfill waste which is currently vented and is not suited to the proposed development;

- access to the site is poor and limited due to the width of Send Hill road, single track from the proposed site entrance to its junction with Potters Lane and narrow throughout its length, with no pavement for pedestrians for most of its length;

- the number of travellers pitches (2) is out of proportion to the number of houses proposed (40);

- Send Cemetery, the peaceful and well maintained lawn cemetery is on Send Hill, close to the proposed site access. The cemetery has over a thousand people laid to rest here and this proposed development would have a detrimental effect to the quiet, reflective and respectful expectations of cemetery users;

- The Villages Health Centre and Send First School are already at capacity level and the village infrastructure is not able to sustain this additional proposed development;

- Send Hill is a quiet and narrow road. Development for housing is inappropriate due to its permanent Green Belt status and high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt by any development.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8306  Respondent: 15156673 / Emma France  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A44. 1.9 ha land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill designated for 40 homes and 2 Travellers Pitches. This site is new and was not included in the regulation 18 draft and have not been consulted upon previously. Development for housing is inappropriate due to its permanent Green Belt status and high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt by any development. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 travellers pitches is inappropriate due to the narrow width track country had providing insufficient access to the site.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

Comment ID: PSLPS16/382  Respondent: 15164065 / Andrew Morton  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to object strongly to the proposed development at Send and Ripley, particularly the A44 site, and for my comments to be seen by the planning inspector.
It appears a previous proposal was rejected and now Guildford BC have decided to ignore this decision and are now looking to push another proposal through, this time with increased house numbers along with gypsy camps and an industrial development built on greenbelt.

As a resident of Worsfold Close, (off Potters Lane) I know how dangerous it is currently, trying to turn on to Potters Lane particularly during the morning and evening rush hours, there is often ill feeling between motorists and I have had several near misses. Towards the end of Potters Lane, as you get near to the A3, the road is mostly single lane and I have seen and been involved with a number of near misses, building more houses, gypsy camps and industrial units will increase traffic and the chances of accidents and possibly fatalities.

Guildford BC obviously see Send as a backwater, out of site and mind, where they can fulfil their quota’s without upsetting the residents living in the expensive part of the borough.

There is really only one way to get from Send/Ripley to Woking, that's over the river Wey at Old Woking, again in rush hour periods and school start and ends, the traffic can back up from Old Woking all the way back to Send village, again this can only get worse.

I also object strongly to Guildford BC’s unbelievable and disgraceful proposal removing Send Village from the Green Belt. This is why many people have decided to make their home here, nearby there are important areas for wildlife, home to many protected species. I understand there needs to be some development, but this should be spread around the Guildford borough and they may need to upset some of their more valued residents, instead of putting so much pressure on the Send/Ripley greenbelt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/903  Respondent: 15172705 / Geraldine Brown  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.29*78.SN HCP dated 5th January 2005-identifies proposed site GBC recorded landfill site ref GU/12 with a type of waste identified as 'unrestricted'. This causes me concern as to what it does contain and dangers if disturbed.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the Traveller Accommodation Assessment research, purported to have been undertaken in June-July 2012 by Mill Field services, cannot be so. The Sittingbourne based market research company was dissolved in January 2011 according to the government companies site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/426  Respondent: 15180833 / Mark Humphriss  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- General Comments: I do not believe that the proposal for this site is sound in that it is not justified and that alternative sites have not been considered.
  - I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the site is not large enough for the proposed use.
  - I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that it would cause adverse impact on street parking.
• I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.

• I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that Send is in green belt. The proposed inset is inappropriate due to its permanent green belt status.

• I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that Send Hill is a narrow road result in loss of a turning point for vehicles.

• I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that it would impact the nature reserve nearby. The proposed site is a quality green belt amenity area within countryside and would be spoilt by development.

• I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the existing road and parking infrastructure is already inadequate or under pressure and could worsen with the planned development, reducing quality of life.

• I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that too many houses are proposed to Send/ Send Marsh are and the impact on traffic congestion and local services would be unacceptable.

• I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the proposed number of houses potentially could result in 92 extra cars in Send Hill which is already suffering from congestion particularly at school run time.

• I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the proposed number of houses is disproportionate to the allocated area.

• I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that this would cause loss of village identity, be detrimental to the community and increased flood risk.

• I object to the proposal in the local plan to provide 2 travellers pitches on the grounds that the proposal is contrary to Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS). In that the proportion of pitches per houses being built is disproportionate. The policy states that the proportion of traveller’s pitches should not exceed 2 per 500 homes. The proposal exceeds those recommendations.

• I object to the proposal in the local plan to provide 2 travellers pitches on the grounds that this proposal has not been previously consulted on.

• I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that a Wasteland Solutions environmental report on Send Hill dated March 2004 gave evidence of past ponding of water in the excavated area. Further development would disturb water table and increase risk of flooding to my property.

• I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the proposed development site (A44) was used as GBC registered landfill site, not a quarry as listed as reference LLA 2081 in the local plan.

• I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the 1963-8 Ordnance Survey maps of proposed site mark it as “refuse and slag heap”. It is therefore unsuitable for such a development on health reasons.

• I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the 1971 Ordnance Survey maps of proposed site mark it as “refuse tip” prior to when proper licensing/registration was required. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. I therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials.

• I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that a Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005 identifies the proposed site as GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/11/LLC with type of waste not identified. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. I therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials.

• I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that a Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005 identifies proposed site GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/12 with type of waste identified as “unrestricted”. This causes me concern as to what it does contain and dangers if disturbed.

• I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that both the Envirosearch Report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004 and historical map data and information from GBC has identified site as landfill and has “areas of potentially contaminative industrial activities”. Development of this site would be a health hazard. The recent news reports of a child dying from seepage of contaminated ground following flooding prove that developing any such sites is a danger to health. The Daily Mail has also recently had an article on how the dangers of living near landfill site raises cancer concerns. The paper referenced a study published by the International Journal of Epidemiology which tracked 242,000 people living near landfill sites in Italy.
I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that both the Envirosearch Report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004 identifies “potential risk from landfill gas migrations” which I believe is a health hazard.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that both Envirosearch Report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004 concludes “potentially contaminative industrial sites identified from analysis” of Ordnance survey maps.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005-Identifies proposed site as local authorised landfill site as licences under Part II of Environmental protection Act 1990. The proposed site is not a quarry as specified in the GBC Local Plan. And is therefore not suitable for the proposed usage.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005-Identifies proposed site as potentially contaminative industrial land. With usage of “Heap and unknown constituents”. This causes me concern as to what it does contain and dangers if disturbed.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005 Identifies changes to proposed site could cause potential ground water vulnerability to my property.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6554  Respondent: 15180833 / Mark Humphriss  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to object to the local plan site with specific reference to the above policy for the following reasons:

I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: The proposed development is not sustainable because of poor infrastructure. Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site for travellers or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.

I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: A Wasteland Solutions environmental report on Send Hill dated March 2004 gave evidence of past ponding of water in the excavated area. Further development would disturb the water table and increase risk of flooding to surrounding properties.

I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: The site was used as a GBC registered landfill site and shown on the 1963-8 Ordnance Survey maps as “refuse and slag heap”. It is therefore unsuitable for such a development on health reasons.

I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: On the 1971 Ordnance Survey the site is shown as a “refuse tip” prior to when proper licensing/registration was required. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. I therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials.

I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: GBC has installed gas monitoring wells on site since July 2000. One well has documented recording of methane gas discharge.

I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: A Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005-Identifies the proposed site as GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/11/LLC with type of waste not identified. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. I therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials.
I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: A Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP
dated 5th January 2005-Identifies proposed site GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/12 with type of waste identified as
“unrestricted”. This causes concern as to what it does contain and the dangers if disturbed.

I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: An Envirosearch Report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004
and historical map data and information from GBC has identified the site as landfill and has “areas of potentially
contaminative industrial activities” and “potential risk from landfill gas migrations”. Development of this site would be a
health hazard.

I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: The site is unsuitable for a traveller site as it is away from the
Village centre and approximately one mile from the shops and the nearest bus stops.

I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: The road Send Hill at the entrance to this site is 2.3 metres wide,
very narrow and additionally unsuitable for long vehicles and on the opposite side of this narrow road is the multi-
denominational Send Cemetery.

I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: Existing road and parking infrastructure is already inadequate or
under pressure and would worsen with the planned development, reducing quality of life.

I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: Existing health infrastructure is already inadequate or under pressure
and would worsen with the planned development.

I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: This area has been extensively used for sand and gravel extraction
and has since been in filled with refuse and is therefore unlikely to be suitable for building. The lane is designated SSSI
and monitored by The Surrey Wildlife Trust. The roads serving this area are extremely narrow lanes without footpaths
and people attempting to walk from here to the Send village shops would be at risk.

I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: The drainage and sewerage systems in this area of the village of
Send are ancient and frequently cause problems as documented by Thames Water Plc. More housing and road users being
added would simply increase the problems further.

I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: All proposals to build on the Green Belt at Send and elsewhere in the
borough because all the development that is really needed can be accommodated in Guildford’s urban Brownfield areas
much closer to existing transport hubs.

I object to all the proposed sites in Send because they were not included in the previous consultation in 2014. Unlike the
rest of the borough Send has not been properly consulted and all its sites have been changed substantially

I object to building 40 houses at Send Hill because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Send Hill is far too narrow to
take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road.

I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely
inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: The government’s most recent policy for traveller sites was
published in August 2015 and sets out the best approaches for planning for traveller sites. Since the Borough’s current
Traveller Accommodation Assessment was published significantly before the 2015 guidance, it should be considered out
of date. The dated nature of the 2012 assessment is recognised in the June 2016 Sustainability Appraisal, which states on
page 94 that the Council have decided to over-allocate traveller sites in light of the dated evidence base.

I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: This site is allocated for 40 homes and 2 traveller pitches. Send Hill
is a very narrow road; two cars have difficulty passing one another in places. An additional 40 homes would significantly
increase the chances of two cars meeting, resulting in congestion and access issues with little scope to widen the road.

I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: Send Hill does not have any pavements for the majority of its length
and would be difficult to walk along, especially for those with push chairs or mobility problems.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**Comment ID:** pslp172/2664  **Respondent:** 15180833 / Mark Humphriss  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A44

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( No ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( Yes )

I believe that the proposal is not sound because it does not comply with Local Policy H1 in that it has allocated Gypsy, Traveller or Traveling Show-people accommodation disproportionality to the size of the site

I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: The proposed development is not sustainable because of poor infrastructure. Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site for travellers or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.

I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: The road Send Hill at the entrance to this site and the approach from Potters Lane is very narrow. Any alternation to improve visibility as acknowledged in the revised GBC Local Plan is not practical due physical limitations at the junction of Send Hill and Potter Lane. Without this alteration the approach road is unsuitable for the increased traffic including long vehicles that will result from developing this site.

I object to policy A44 as building further houses at Send Hill would exassapate the problem of inadequate access due to increased traffic volume. Send Hill is far too narrow to take any more traffic. The junction with Potters Lane is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into Potters Lane. Any alternation to improve visibility as acknowledged in the GBC Local Plan is not practical due physical limitations at the junction of Send Hill and Potter Lane.

I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: On the 1971 Ordnance Survey the site is shown as a “refuse tip” prior to when proper licensing/registration was required. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. **It is acknowledged in the revised GBC Local Plan that contamination is a concern.** It must therefore be recognised that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials to both existing and future residents of the site.

I object to policy A44 as it is in direct conflict to Local Plan policy H1. This policy states that “Gypsy, Traveller or Traveling Show-people accommodation should be provided on development sites of 500 homes or more whilst there remain an identified need”. Site A44 has only be allocated 40 houses and so has therefore been disproportionately allocated 2 pitches.

I object to policy A44 as it is in direct conflict to Local Plan policy H1. This policy states that “Gypsy, Traveller or Traveling Show-people accommodation should be provided on development sites of 500 homes or more whilst there remain an identified need”. The GBC Traveller Accommodation Assessment does not justify an identified need.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/616  **Respondent:** 15192481 / Thomas Collins  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( No ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I object to the inclusion of this site for development in the local plan. This site is a new proposal that was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted on previously. This is a beautiful area of countryside that would be harmed by development and it fully justifies its current Green Belt designation. The subsoil in this area contains documented unsafe landfill waste which is currently vented, further calling into question its suitability for development. The roads in this area are occasionally narrow single track country roads and so access to this site would be restricted, calling into question the logic of providing 2 Travellers pitches here.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/499</th>
<th>Respondent: 15196161 / Michael Corlett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Policy A44. I object to the proposed development on the land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill. This site is Green Belt and is also unsuitable because the subsoil is unsafe as it is an old land fill site and is currently vented because of noxious gases. It is also unsuitable because of the narrow lane and very dangerous blind corner with the junction of Potters Lane and quite unsuitable for Travellers Pitches with their lorries and caravans. The additional traffic generated would be impossible on an already narrow roads which gets very congested with school traffic and parking, particularly during the morning and evening rush hours.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/733</th>
<th>Respondent: 15198913 / Diana Gordon</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Policy A44. 1.9. ha land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill designated for 4- homes and 2 travellers pitches. This has not been consulted upon. The subsoil contains documented unsafe landfill waste and the site is inappropriate due to the narrow country road, with insufficient access to the site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strongly OBJECT to all of these plans and feel it goes completely against honouring your repeated election promises to protect the green belt!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like all my comments to be seen by the inspector.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please do the right thing and save Send and Ripley's hugely important Green Belt. I feel it is important to honour promises made and that this development Plan will cause a loss of trust by all residents. It will disrupt the idealistic village environment currently enjoyed and destroy the desirability to live in such an incredible area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not destroy the identity of our village.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act in the interests of the current residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/546</th>
<th>Respondent: 15205569 / Mark Gurdon</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/553</td>
<td>Respondent: 15205921 / Elizabeth Howlett</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/560</th>
<th>Respondent: 15206497 / Vivien Bancroft</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to policy A44 which would see 40 homes and two travellers' pitches on land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill. This was again a NEW site NOT included in 18 draft and therefore has NOT been consulted on previously. Once again this is Green Belt land partly containing unsafe landfill. Access is by a narrow lane which could never take the volume of traffic that would ensue from traveller's pitches.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/585</th>
<th>Respondent: 15208289 / M. J Payne</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I list below my objections to parts of the local plan and request that they are brought to the attention of the Inspector.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Policy A44. 1.9ha LAND WEST OF WINDS RIDGE AND SEND HILL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to this Policy as this site has not previously been included and has not been consulted upon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This land is part of the Green Belt and in past years has been a large land fill site and is still vented which would make it unsafe. The Travellers Pitches are inappropriate due to insufficient access due to the narrow, at times single track, country lane. Any extra traffic would make this lane unsafe and affect the peace and tranquillity of the Cemetery opposite which itself has been enlarged very recently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/592 | Respondent: 15208353 / Janet Green | Agent: |
4) Policy A44.1.9 ha Land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill designated for 40 homes and 2 travellers pitches.

This site is NEW and was NOT included in the regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted upon previously. Development for housing is inappropriate due to its permanent Green Belt status and high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt by any development. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
4) **Policy A44.1.9 ha Land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill designated for 40 homes and 2 travellers pitches.**

This site is **NEW** and was **NOT** included in the regulation 18 draft and has **NOT** been consulted upon previously. Development for housing is inappropriate due to its permanent Green Belt status and high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoil by any development. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/657  **Respondent:** 15225281 / Roger Gamlin  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** (No),  **is Sound?** (No),  **is Legally Compliant?** (No)

I Object

This development is too much for the village to sustain.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6385  **Respondent:** 15225281 / Roger Gamlin  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ),  **is Sound?** ( ),  **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I also Object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill, again the roads are single lane and too narrow for any traffic increase.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/675  **Respondent:** 15226625 / M Mackender Lewis  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ),  **is Sound?** ( ),  **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

Alterations to Local Plan Site A44

I refer to latest addition to the local plan for Send's future development. This site would obviously be built on Green Belt Land which is totally unsuitable for this area
I object for the following reasons-

1. I object to - Send Hill is a very narrow lane and where this site will be there is absolutely there is no room for vehicles to pass each other, therefore the road would have to be widened, at a considerable cost, to enable lorries and caravans to go back and forth on this site.

The sewage in Send Hill has always been a problem with excess effluence, there is considerable back up so our properties has to be cleaned out on a regular basis, this will only be exacerbated by any additional properties.

2. I object to - The private owner part of this development which is opposite our property has become a haven for wild life with deer and there young, badgers, rabbits, bees, owls, and various species of birds.

3. I object to - When this piece of land was sold to the present owner there was a Covenant that a comer of this plot should not be disturbed as it was used as a dog and pet cemetery. Building on this plot surely is breaking the lease.

4. The GBC area of this development has been used for many years for recreation, children and dog walkers.

5. I object to - Previously the land was used and a waste infill. This infill was extremely toxic and has been vented over a period of time. If building was to take place, surely this would disturb any existing toxicity present which could result in serious problems!

6. The Cemetery enlargement in Send Hill has now been offered to all denominations which will increase both traffic and parking problems adding yet more chaos from your proposed development. If you take in consideration the traffic from schools and their latest rebuilds, this will increase the traffic problems. By the riding stables on Send Hill the road gets even narrower and very dangerous leading into Potters Lane.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/690</th>
<th>Respondent: 15228833 / S Allwood</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the land west of Winds Ridge being designated for a travellers site and 40 houses - this is an open site and it would be dangerous to have an opening on to the narrow Send Hill.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/700</th>
<th>Respondent: 15229313 / Caitlin Gordon</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object for the following reasons-

1. I object to - Send Hill is a very narrow lane and where this site will be there is absolutely there is no room for vehicles to pass each other, therefore the road would have to be widened, at a considerable cost, to enable lorries and caravans to go back and forth on this site.

The sewage in Send Hill has always been a problem with excess effluence, there is considerable back up so our properties has to be cleaned out on a regular basis, this will only be exacerbated by any additional properties.

2. I object to - The private owner part of this development which is opposite our property has become a haven for wild life with deer and there young, badgers, rabbits, bees, owls, and various species of birds.

3. I object to - When this piece of land was sold to the present owner there was a Covenant that a comer of this plot should not be disturbed as it was used as a dog and pet cemetery. Building on this plot surely is breaking the lease.

4. The GBC area of this development has been used for many years for recreation, children and dog walkers.

5. I object to - Previously the land was used and a waste infill. This infill was extremely toxic and has been vented over a period of time. If building was to take place, surely this would disturb any existing toxicity present which could result in serious problems!

6. The Cemetery enlargement in Send Hill has now been offered to all denominations which will increase both traffic and parking problems adding yet more chaos from your proposed development. If you take in consideration the traffic from schools and their latest rebuilds, this will increase the traffic problems. By the riding stables on Send Hill the road gets even narrower and very dangerous leading into Potters Lane.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
7) Policy A44. 1.9. ha land west of winds ridge and send hill designated for 4- homes and 2 travellers pitches. This has not been consulted upon. The subsoil contains documented unsafe landfill waste and the site is inappropriate due to the narrow country road, with insufficient access to the site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/719  Respondent: 15233217 / Mary Allwood  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the travellers site and 40 houses being built on a piece of land opposite Winds Ridge. Send Hill is much to narrow for this suggestion.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/763  Respondent: 15234849 / Alastair Fleming  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of land west of Wind Ridge and Send Hill designated for 40 homes and 2 Travellers' Pitches (Policy A44). The site was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon prior to the inclusion in the 2016 Local Plan.

12. I object to the impact of Policy A44 on an area of beautiful Green Belt countryside.

13. I object to the impact of Policy A44 as the subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented.

14. I object to the impact of Policy A44, which includes 2 Travellers' Pitches, on the local infrastructure. The narrow width single track country road provides insufficient access for the pitches.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/754  Respondent: 15236769 / Linda Aboel  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill. It is an inapp location because the narrow single access country road provides insufficient access. The subsoil of the proposed site contains documented unsafe landfill waste registered at GBC. Any development there would spoil a high amenity area set in beautiful countryside.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/767</th>
<th>Respondent: 15238881 / Stephen John Tully</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill, this is high quality amenity land within the Green Belt and is an area of beautiful countryside which could be spoilt. This site is a former landfill site and is known to contain hazardous waste.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposal to include 2 traveller's pitches in the Send Hill site as this completely inappropriate considering access which is very restricted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2777</th>
<th>Respondent: 15238881 / Stephen John Tully</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to any development at Send Hill proposals to develop this site have blighted the Send Hill community for nearly a decade. Proposals for gypsy site / affordable housing was first tabled – 2007. The objections from Send residents ran into many hundreds. These responses must still be on record, are they just ignored?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposed development in Send Hill on health grounds. The site is a former land fill site, insufficient records are available to indicate what is buried there; the environment agency website indicates all types waste was disposed of including hazardous. My environmental surveyor indicated that there old landfill site were not dangerous if left alone and undisturbed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposed development in Send Hill as it would destroy a beautiful tranquil amenity used by many villages. This field is regularly used by the local community for recreational use such as dog walking jogging rambling cricket and picnics. It is surrounded by public footpaths and has many mature trees and bushes upon it. It is a quiet area and forms a perfect haven for wildlife and birds including deer, bats, rabbits, squirrels, moles, hedgehogs, jays, woodpeckers to name a few. There is a large pond nearby containing frogs newts and wild fowl. Some of these species are protected. It is only disturbed once or twice a year when the grass is cut or when the footpaths are cut back. I believe this public open space should be retained as there is an identified shortage of recreational open spaces within the borough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposal at Send Hill because Send Hill is a single track country road; it is too narrow to accommodate the potential new levels of traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/774</th>
<th>Respondent: 15239297 / T Fleming</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. I object to the inclusion of land west of Wind Ridge and Send Hill designated for 40 homes and 2 Travellers' Pitches (Policy A44). The site was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon prior to the inclusion in the 2016 Local Plan.

12. I object to the impact of Policy A44 on an area of beautiful Green Belt countryside.

13. I object to the impact of Policy A44 as the subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented.

14. I object to the impact of Policy A44, which includes 2 Travellers' Pitches, on the local infrastructure. The narrow width single track country road provides insufficient access for the pitches.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that both the Envirosearch report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004 and historical map data and information from GBC has identified site as landfill and has "areas of potentially contaminative industrial activities". Development of this site would be a health hazard. The recent reports of a child dying from seepage of contaminated ground following flooding prove that developing any such sites is a danger to health. Send is surrounded by old gravel pits that were filled in in the late 50's early 60's. The Daily Mail has also recently had an article on how the dangers of living near a landfill site raises cancer concerns. The paper referenced a study published by the International Journey of Epidemiology which tracked 242,000 people living near landfill sites in Italy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width of single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1052  Respondent: 15260865 / K M Pearmain  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A44 would involve building on land fill waste which is currently vented and unsafe.

I object to this.

Policy P2 proposed building on land close to the River Wey Navigation and liable to flooding. It also would improve taking Send out of the Green Belt. There is no need to do this as there are alternatives more suited to the existing road infrastructure.

I object to this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4517  Respondent: 15262305 / L J Crane  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A44 which would see 40 homes and two travellers' pitches on land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill. This was again a new site not included in 18 draft and therefore has not been consulted on previously. Once again this is Green Belt land partly containing unsafe landfill. Access is by a narrow lane which could never take the volume of traffic that would ensue from traveller's pitches.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4521  Respondent: 15262305 / L J Crane  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.
I OBJECT to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the proposed number of houses potentially could result in 92 extra cars in Send Hill which is already suffering from congestion particularly at school run time.

I OBJECT to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that a wasteland solutions environmental report on Send Hill dated March 2004 gave evidence of past ponding of water in the excavated area. Further development would disturb water table and increase risk of flooding to my property.

I OBJECT to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the proposed development site (A44) was used as OBC registered landfill site, not a quarry as listed as reference LLA 2081 in the local plan.

I OBJECT to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the 1963-8 Ordnance Survey maps of the proposed site mark it as "refuse and slag heap". It is therefore unsuitable for such a development on health reasons.

I OBJECT to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the Traveller Accommodation Assessment research. purported to have been undertaken in June-July 2012 by Mill Field Services, cannot be the case. The Sittingbourne based market research company was dissolved in January 2011 according to the government companies site.

I OBJECT to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that both Enviros search report RS1100201 _1 _1 dated 17th February 2004 concludes "potentially contaminative industrial sites identified from analysis" of Ordnance survey maps.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: The proposed development is not sustainable because of poor infrastructure. Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site for travellers or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: A Wasteland Solutions environmental report on Send Hill dated March 2004 gave evidence of past ponding of water in the excavated area. Further development would disturb the water table and increase risk of flooding to surrounding properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: The site was used as a GBC registered landfill site and shown on the 1963-8 Ordnance Survey maps as “refuse and slag heap”. It is therefore unsuitable for such a development on health reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: On the 1971 Ordnance Survey the site is shown as a “refuse tip” prior to when proper licensing/registration was required. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. I therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: GBC has installed gas monitoring wells on site since July 2000. One well has documented recording of methane gas discharge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: A Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005-Identifies the proposed site as GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/11/LLC with type of waste not identified. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. I therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: A Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005-Identifies proposed site GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/12 with type of waste identified as “unrestricted”. This causes concern as to what it does contain and the dangers if disturbed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: An Envirosearch Report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004 and historical map data and information from GBC has identified the site as landfill and has “areas of potentially contaminative industrial activities” and “potential risk from landfill gas migrations”. Development of this site would be a health hazard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: The site is unsuitable for a traveller site as it is away from the Village centre and approximately one mile from the shops and the nearest bus stops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: The road Send Hill at the entrance to this site is 2.3 metres wide, very narrow and additionally unsuitable for long vehicles and on the opposite side of this narrow road is the multi-denominational Send Cemetery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: Existing road and parking infrastructure is already inadequate or under pressure and would worsen with the planned development, reducing quality of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: Existing health infrastructure is already inadequate or under pressure and would worsen with the planned development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: This area has been extensively used for sand and gravel extraction and has since been in filled with refuse and is therefore unlikely to be suitable for building. The lane is designated SSSI and monitored by The Surrey Wildlife Trust. The roads serving this area are extremely narrow lanes without footpaths and people attempting to walk from here to the Send village shops would be at risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: The drainage and sewerage systems in this area of the village of Send are ancient and frequently cause problems as documented by Thames Water Plc. More housing and road users being added would simply increase the problems further.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: All proposals to build on the Green Belt at Send and elsewhere in the borough because all the development that is really needed can be accommodated in Guildford’s urban Brownfield areas much closer to existing transport hubs.

I object to all the proposed sites in Send because they were not included in the previous consultation in 2014. Unlike the rest of the borough Send has not been properly consulted and all its sites have been changed substantially.

I object to building 40 houses at Send Hill because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Send Hill is far too narrow to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road.

I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: The government’s most recent policy for traveller sites was published in August 2015 and sets out the best approaches for planning for traveller sites. Since the Borough’s current Traveller Accommodation Assessment was published significantly before the 2015 guidance, it should be considered out of date. The dated nature of the 2012 assessment is recognised in the June 2016 Sustainability Appraisal, which states on page 94 that the Council have decided to over-allocate traveller sites in light of the dated evidence base.

I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: This site is allocated for 40 homes and 2 traveller pitches. Send Hill is a very narrow road; two cars have difficulty passing one another in places. An additional 40 homes would significantly increase the chances of two cars meeting, resulting in congestion and access issues with little scope to widen the road.

I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: Send Hill does not have any pavements for the majority of its length and would be difficult to walk along, especially for those with push chairs or mobility problems.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2665  Respondent: 15271969 / Denise Humphriss  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: The proposed development is not sustainable because of poor infrastructure. Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site for travellers or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.

I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: The road Send Hill at the entrance to this site and the approach from Potters Lane is very narrow. Any alteration to improve visibility as acknowledged in the revised GBC Local Plan is not practical due physical limitations at the junction of Send Hill and Potter Lane. Without this alteration the approach road is unsuitable for the increased traffic including long vehicles that will result from developing this site.

I object to policy A44 as building further houses at Send Hill would exaspsate the problem of inadequate access due to increased traffic volume. Send Hill is far too narrow to take any more traffic. The junction with Potters Lane is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into Potters Lane. Any alteration to improve visibility as acknowledged in the GBC Local Plan is not practical due physical limitations at the junction of Send Hill and Potter Lane.

I object to policy A44 in Send Hill on the basis that: On the 1971 Ordnance Survey the site is shown as a “refuse tip” prior to when proper licensing/registration was required. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. It is acknowledged in the revised GBC Local Plan that contamination is a concern. It must therefore be recognised that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials to both existing and future residents of the site.

I object to policy A44 as it is in direct conflict to Local Plan policy H1. This policy states that “Gypsy, Traveller or Traveling Show-people accommodation should be provided on development sites of 500 homes or more whilst there remain an identified need”. Site A44 has only be allocated 40 houses and so has therefore been disproportionately allocated 2 pitches.
I object to policy A44 as it is in direct conflict to Local Plan policy H1. This policy states that “Gypsy, Traveller or Traveling Show-people accommodation should be provided on development sites of 500 homes or more whilst there remain an identified need”. The GBC Traveller Accommodation Assessment does not justify an identified need.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1135  Respondent: 15273441 / Andrew Heffernan-McClelland  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( No ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that Send Hill I a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the proposed number of housing potentially could result in extra cars in Send Hill which is already suffering from congestion particularly at school run time.

I object to the proposal in local plan on the grounds that the 1963-8 Ordnance Survey maps of the proposed site mark it as "refuse and slag heap". It is therefore unsuitable for such a development on health reasons.

I object to the in the local plan on the grounds that the 1971 Ordnance Survey maps of proposed site mark as "refuse tip" prior to when proper licensing/registration was required. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. I therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be a heath hazard due to the unknown materials.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7227  Respondent: 15274241 / Chris Finden-Browne  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) , is Sound? ( ) , is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to Policy A44 which covers development on land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill on several grounds:
  - This site is a new entry in the Plan and was NOT included in the Regulation 18 draft or previous consultations.
  - A significant part of the site has documented unsafe historical landfill waste on which the impact of building is unknown and could easily be detrimental to the health of new and existing residents.
  - Send Hill is unsuited to a traffic increase, especially for large vehicles such as associated with Travellers Pitches. The portion leading from the Send cemetery to Potters Lane is single track and both winding (so poor advance visibility) and steep. There would a dramatic increase in vehicles meeting other vehicles headed in the other direction with no easy or safe place to pass each other. Significant incidents of the 'road rage' type would likely occur.

The junction of Send Hill with Potters Lane is already dangerous and an accident black-spot. We have personal experience of this: turning right out of Send Hill has a high risk of moving into the path of vehicles travelling south along Potters Lane, as they cannot be seen until the right turn procedure is already committed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPS16/1310  Respondent: 15294113 / M J Hickman  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the late, unconsulted, plans for Winds Ridge and Send Hill.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1331  Respondent: 15297441 / Michael Rhodes  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

My name is [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998].

I wish to object to this development on the grounds of that the size of the development, the fact that it is to be built on contaminated land of a former landfill site which if disturbed could be detrimental to our health and well being.

Send Hills infrastructure is insufficient for such a large development.

We would lose a lovely amenity that is enjoyed by many

I am concerned about the potential flooding risk

I am concerned about Send losing its Green Belt status.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1332  Respondent: 15297505 / Alison Rhodes  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As a resident of Send Hill, I would like to object to the above development of 40 houses and two travellers pitches on the following grounds:

1. The site is an inappropriate location due to the narrow width of the single country road
2. The proposed land contains documented contaminated landfill waste registered at Guildford BC and could cause danger to health and well being if disturbed
3. If this land is disturbed, it could have an impact on the geological structure of the area including the water table
4. The development will have an impact on nature and the ecological structure within the area i.e. Nature reserve
5. The overall infrastructure within the immediate area is already stretched to capacity.
Overall, this development will have a negative effect on village/community life and would be grateful if my objections could be documented and recorded.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1584  Respondent: 15299041 / Elizabeth Teece  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

5. I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill. This is an inappropriate location because the narrow width single access country road provides insufficient access.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1382  Respondent: 15301153 / Colin Weekley  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Ref; Policy A44 1.9.ha- land Winds Ridge and Send Hill. 40 homes and two travellers pitches.

I must declare I am utterly opposed to this proposal. This site is new and was not included in the regulations 18 draft, and has not been consulted upon previously.

It's inappropriate with the narrow width of the single track road, of Potters Lane, off the A3 motorway, this gets very congested in the morning and late afternoon, owing to the fact, of the nature of the narrow road. At the top of Potters Lane, the one sided parking and narrowness of the road makes congestion worse. I believe it is a shame that this area will be ruined and blighted by extra traffic, in the vicinity of such a lovely little church. So I utterly oppose this development plan.

Yours sincerely, C.E.Weekley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1431  Respondent: 15315233 / Andree Grimshaw  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A44. I OBJECT to building on this land as it is Green Belt.

"Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances." There is no exceptional circumstances here, there is plenty of land available at Slyfield which is not green belt.

Please can all of the above comments be passed to the inspector.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1436</th>
<th>Respondent: 153220673 / Rosie Beauvais</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td>I am writing in reference to the planned development on the 'Land West Of Wind Ridges And Send Hill'. Policy A44 1.9a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I object to the proposal on the grounds that parts of Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed new development would bring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the existing road and parking infrastructure is already inadequate and under pressure and will worsen with the planned development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I object to the proposal in the local plan that too many houses are proposed for Send and the impact on traffic congestion and local services would be unacceptable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds Send is in the green belt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that it would impact the nature reserve close by. The proposed site is a quality green belt amenity area within countryside and would be spoilt by development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that this would cause the loss of the village identity, be detrimental to the community and cause increased flood risk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the Environsearch Report RS1100201-1-1 dated 17th February 2004 concludes 'potentially contaminative industrial sites identified from analysis of Ordinance survey maps.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1478</th>
<th>Respondent: 15325505 / Mark Dominey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td>I object to this development plan. This is a beautiful green belt area and inappropriate for the proposed development. The area would be completely spoiled and the single track road is not sufficient for access. This is also a new proposal not previously consulted upon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT

POLICY A44

1.9 ha LAND WEST OF WINDS RIDGE AND SEND HILL designated for 40 homes and 2 Travellers Pitches. This site is NEW and was NOT included in the regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted upon previously. Originally in the 1990s GBC purchased this site with the express propose to prevent travellers access. and to the triangle to the east end of this site. No account or reason has been given by GBC for this change in policy.

Development for housing is inappropriate due to its permanent Green Belt status and high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoil by any development. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road at one end providing insufficient access to the site whereas the other end already carries a heavy volume of traffic at school opening and closing times and would put children at risk. There is already gridlock at Send Traffic lights at these times and along the A247. NOT taken into consideration are the proposals to the building of a new school to replace St.Bedes. As these stand at present access to the new building would appear to be via the A247 only which might alleviate the traffic at the bottom of Send Hill but it is inconceivable that this will remain so because the School traffic on the A247 at school times with parents from both Schools picking up and setting down will cause gridlock on this road which will extend from about 3 pm into the evening rush hour. It is thus likely that the entrance to the school off Send Hill will be reinstated.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1494  Respondent: 15326657 / Janet Davie  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3. Specific Sites

1. Send Hill (site no. A44)

2. Site Access: I OBJECT since this development will increase traffic along Send Hill. This is a very narrow road (or lane) that, for one third of its length, permits only single file traffic. Any increase in traffic volumes must increase the risk of accidents. I have already witnessed several occasions where two cars only just missed hitting each other (i.e. coming head to head). I personally avoid using this road due to the perceived risk of a serious accident. In addition the junction between Send Hill and Potters Lane is hazardous, due to poor sight lines, with numerous accidents observed.

3. Flooding: I OBJECT since part of the site comprises a bowl formation that has flooded most winters for many years. This, together with a large pond on adjacent land, indicates a high water table in this area. Any disturbance to the site would possibly alter the water table thus causing flooding to adjacent properties.

4. Site Contamination: I OBJECT since Guildford Borough Council used the site as a refuse tip/landfill site for many years. The site is therefore unsuitable for development on health grounds.
5. **Site Over development**: I **OBJECT** since the site is too small for the proposed uses.

6. **Outside current development boundary**: I **OBJECT** since this development lies outside the existing housing outline of the village, and should therefore be refused to avoid both loss of green belt land and creeping development between Send, Woking, and Guildford.

7. **Increased demand on village services**: I **OBJECT** since this proposed development will add additional houses to the existing village stock, thereby increasing demands on existing village services, e.g. schools and health services. These are already recognised as being oversubscribed. Any development, which further increases demand, must be deferred until after additional investment by the Borough/County has increased their capacities.

8. **Loss of amenity**: I **OBJECT** since the site has been used as a public open space for many, many years. It is understood the timescale is such as to confer the formal status and protection of Public Open Space status to the site, which then prohibits development.

9. **Loss of amenity**: I **OBJECT** since the site is part of the rural nature of this part of Send. Adding houses, and associated access/service roads, will detract from this setting, be visible for long distances, and will adversely alter the character of the area. In particular scenic views to and from the River Way and St Mary’s Church will be adversely impacted.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5447  **Respondent:** 15326817 / Peter Jennings-Giles  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I **OBJECT** to policy A44 which would see 40 homes and two travellers' pitches on land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill. This was again a NEW site NOT included in 18 draft and therefore has NOT been consulted on previously. Once again this is Green Belt land partly containing unsafe landfill. Access is by a narrow lane which could never take the volume of traffic that would ensue from traveller's pitches.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1594  **Respondent:** 15341441 / Gillian Thorpe  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A44- I strongly object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill.

The narrow country lane (Send Hill) would not cope with any additional traffic. It is narrow and already busy with traffic to the cemetery (which has recently been extended). The junction at the bottom of Send Hill with Potters Lane is very dangerous due to speeding traffic off of the A3. Any more traffic would make it even more hazardous. It is an inappropriate location for 40 houses because the road is narrow and single access. Also the soil of the proposed site contains documented unsafe landfill waste registered at GBC. The land is totally unsuitable for dwellings and traveller pitches. I believe the unsafe landfill will be harmful to health of any home owners. Any development there would spoil a high amenity area set in beautiful countryside. The area is used for recreational activities such as walking and would be greatly missed by locals.

Send will not be able to cope with the proposed developments. St Bedes C/E School will shortly be demolished. Currently a new school is being built in the grounds of Send First School. The new infant/middle school when complete...
The document is discussing concerns about a planned development. It mentions that the area is not suitable for increased housing due to narrow single access roads and the presence of unsafe landfill waste. The respondents object to the development due to traffic concerns and environmental impacts. They suggest amendments to address these issues. The document also requests feedback on whether the section complies with the Duty to Cooperate and is legally compliant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1641</th>
<th>Respondent: 15342753 / Mike Milne</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object to policy A44</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The land to the west of Winds Ridge is a disused land fill site. It was filled with unsafe waste which was noted by Guildford Borough Council. Apart from the fact that the ground is full of unsafe waste and should not be disturbed, Send Hill is a narrow country road and does not provide suitable access. Further development around Send Hill would add to the traffic problem that already exists in the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1663</th>
<th>Respondent: 15343713 / Sara Frohmader</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I also object to the proposal to build 40 new houses and travellers pitches on Send Hill (A44). This is a small lane with lovely views. The walk to the Church is enjoyed by many residents and it would be totally out of keeping in this environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1668</th>
<th>Respondent: 15343745 / Stephanie Harris</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy A44 - Land West of Winds Ridge and Send Hill</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the development plan under policy A44. This site has also not been previously consulted upon. It is a small area of lovely green belt countryside, the development would completely spoil the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1669</th>
<th>Respondent: 15343969 / Mark Hebberd</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1679</td>
<td>Respondent: 15344641 / Ann Court</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 pitches on Send Hill called the Paddocks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Again access to this site is very narrow especially from the Cemetery down to Potters Lane where that junction is often a cause for concern the way the traffic speeds along Potters Lane and again an inappropriate place for houses and travellers site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1712</th>
<th>Respondent: 15345825 / Barry Weekley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ref; Policy A44 1.9 ha- Winds Ridge and Send Hill.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am writing to express my concern over the development of 40 homes, and two travellers sites at Winds Ridge and Send Hill. I am utterly opposed to this proposal, which is not in the regulation 18 draft, and I find Potters Lane will not be enhanced in any way, by the extra traffic and inconvenience caused to this quiet lane.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1824</th>
<th>Respondent: 15350081 / Tania Parslow</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fourthly, I object to the building of 40 houses and 2 traveller’s pitches at Send Hill. This road is narrow and winding and the land is unsuitable as it is an ex landfill site which would be unsafe for development and is best left to be appreciated as an area of beautiful countryside.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1840</td>
<td>Respondent: 15350689 / Brian Peed</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers’ pitches at Send Hill. It is an inappropriate location because the narrow width single access country road provides insufficient access. The subsoil of the proposed site contains documented unsafe landfill waste registered at GBC. Any development there would spoil a high amenity area set in beautiful countryside.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1942</th>
<th>Respondent: 15356513 / Anthony Gatford</th>
<th>Agent: Tony Gatford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 travelers pitches at Send Hill. It is an inappropriate location, which would be serviced by a narrow single access Country road. Subsoil at the proposed site contains unsafe landfill waste as registered with GBC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1949</th>
<th>Respondent: 15356833 / Carolyn Gatford</th>
<th>Agent: Tony Gatford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 travelers pitches at Send Hill. It is an inappropriate location, which would be serviced by a narrow single access Country road. Subsoil at the proposed site contains unsafe landfill waste as registered with GBC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1969</th>
<th>Respondent: 15357697 / Ros Reeves</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 travelers pitches at Send Hill. It is an inappropriate location, which would be serviced by a narrow single access Country road. Subsoil at the proposed site contains unsafe landfill waste as registered with GBC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the proposed development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill. The narrow width single access country road provides insufficient access. Also the site contains unsafe landfill waste registered with Guildford Borough Council.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1976</th>
<th>Respondent: 15357985 / Susan Rowley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a resident of Send, I am writing to Object to the proposed Draft Local Plan.

I object to Send village being taken out of the Green Belt. This is because the Green Belt I understand was always intended to be permenant as required by the National Planning Policy Framework, and there are no special circumstances to justify abandoning it. Send's Green Belt provides a much needed buffer to prevent the village being swallowed up and becoming a suburb of Woking & Guildford.P2

I also object to the proposal to build 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill.

This location is entirely inappropriate since the only access road is very narrow, and also the subsoil of the proposed site contains well documented unsafe landfill waste that has to be regularly vented this information is registered with GBC.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2008</th>
<th>Respondent: 15358625 / Ron Best</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, I understand there is a proposal for 40 houses and two travellers' pitches at send Hill. Such a proposal will destroy a further area of open ground which affords pleasant views down towards the Wey. It is clearly not an appropriate site for this development, so I must object to that, too.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2165</th>
<th>Respondent: 15370529 / J Wells</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches on Send. This inappropriate development would cause no end of traffic problems as the narrow single width road is insufficient access. The subsoil of the proposed site is a documented unsafe landfill with GBC. Again the beautiful countryside would be damaged, also additional pollution issues would be created. This is currently an area of outstanding natural beauty.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2173  Respondent: 15370689 / C.E. Phillips  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. **OBJECT** to the development of Send Hiii.

I object to the proposal in the Local Plan on the grounds that a Wasteland Solutions environmental report on Send Hill dated March 2004 gave evidence of past ponding of water in the excavated area. Further development would disturb water table and increase the risk flooding to nearby properties.

The proposed site was used by GBC as a landfill site (and not a quarry as stated elsewhere) and on ordnance survey map it is marked as "refuse and slag heap". Any disturbance to the site would be a health hazard due to the unknown materials. It is therefore unsuitable for such a development due to health reasons.

Since July 2000, GBC installed Gas Monitoring wells. One well recording methane gas discharge. A recent newspaper article on how the dangers of living near landfill sites raises cancer concerns. Send Hill is a single track country lane and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6556  Respondent: 15371809 / Susan Pengilly  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the plan to build 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill. This is inappropriate with a narrow width single access country road. Subsoil of proposed site also contains documented unsafe landfill waste registered at GBC.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5869  Respondent: 15384257 / Marlene Harwood  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the building of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill. It is an inappropriate location because the narrow single width country road provides insufficient access.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2322  **Respondent:** 15385281 / Daniel Tarrant  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object Policy A44. Winds Ridge and Send Hill

I object to this development because it was not include in the regulation 18 draft and has not been previously consulted upon.

It is on Green belt, permanently protected by NPPF to prevent the merging of settlements. There are no exceptional circumstances for taking this site out of the Green Belt.

The site contains documented unsafe landfill waste which is currently vented.

The site is also in a single track lane which is unsuitable for larger vehicle access, which the two traveller pitches would require.

The Lane also the site of the Cemetery, a peaceful place to reflect and remember those who have gone before us.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2360  **Respondent:** 15388641 / Eva Hay  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

-I object to the proposal of development at Send Hill in the local plan on the grounds that both the Envirossearch Report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004 identifies ‘potential risk from landfill gas migration’ which is a health hazard. The ground is already being vented.

-I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 Travellers pitches at Send Hill because it is in a most beautiful part of the Green Belt.

-I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 Travellers pitches at Send Hill because access is gained from a very small single track country lane which is totally inappropriate for any traffic larger than the occasional car.

-I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 Travellers pitches at Send Hill because too many houses are proposed in the Send area and the impact on traffic congestion and local services would be unacceptable.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2366  **Respondent:** 15389025 / Keith Cogan  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

40 Houses at Send Hill A44
I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. I frequently walk my dog through this area and the open land is even more appreciated and ‘special’ since the adjacent farmer’s lands have been sold off as private plots and fenced to stop people walking there. Another ‘lost’ section of open countryside. I also object because I understand the subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site. This lane is already dangerous and in particular the junction with Potters Lane where I live is extremely dangerous.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the site is not large enough for the proposed use. It would severely impact on street parking making the road even more dangerous. And again I object on the grounds that Send is in green belt. The proposed inset is inappropriate due to its permanent green belt status and I object in the strongest possible way to this erosion of greenbelt. I also object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that it would impact the nature reserve nearby. I have personally observed and enjoyed walking through this area, the wildlife including many butterflies, birds including lapwings that nest on the adjacent field every year. The proposed site is a quality green belt amenity area within countryside and would be spoilt by development. I am also concerned that I believe this area has been used as a landfill site – not as a quarry as seems to be suggested. I am also concerned about increasing run off, erosion (already visible along the roads) and flooding in the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
will not be able to cope with a large influx of children. There does not seem to be any long term planning in line with GBC proposals.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2433  Respondent: 15391329 / Marian Tarrant  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object Policy A44. Winds Ridge and Send Hill
I object to this development because it was not included in the regulation 18 draft and has not been previously consulted upon.

It is on Green belt, permanently protected by NPPF to prevent the merging of settlements. There are no exceptional circumstances for taking this site out of the Green Belt.

The site contains documented unsafe landfill waste which is currently vented.

The site is also in a single track lane which is unsuitable for larger vehicle access, which the two traveller pitches would require.

The Lane is the site of the Cemetery, a peaceful place to reflect and remember those who have gone before us.

I object because of the increased pressure on local facilities, Doctors, Schools etc. that 485+ homes would bring to Send.

485 new homes would generate circa half a class, the new amalgamated Send school has no capacity for these pupils.

Send does not need, nor do we want a 25% increase in population.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2429  Respondent: 15391361 / Paul Thorpe  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A4 y I strongly object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill. The narrow country lane (Send Hill) would not cope with any additional traffic. It is narrow and already busy with traffic to the cemetery (which has recently been extended). The junction at the bottom of Send Hill with Potters Lane is very dangerous due to speeding traffic off of the A3. Any more traffic would make it even more hazardous. It is an inappropriate location for 40 houses because the road is narrow and single access. Also the soil of the proposed site contains documented unsafe landfill waste registered at GBC. The land is totally unsuitable for dwellings and traveller pitches. I believe the unsafe landfill will be harmful to health of any home owners. Any development there would spoil a high amenity area set in beautiful countryside. The area is used for recreational activities such as walking and would be greatly missed by locals.

Send will not be able to cope with the proposed developments. St Bedes C/E School will shortly be demolished. Currently a new school is being built in the grounds of Send First School. The new infant/middle school when complete
will not be able to cope with a large influx of children. There does not seem to be any long term planning in line with GBC proposals.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2443  Respondent: 15391809 / Dan Haskins  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

For similar reasons, I also object to the proposed development on Send Hill, a narrow road already under strain during school pick up times. Increasing traffic volumes and adding further development will add yet more congestion to another quiet, peaceful residential area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2447  Respondent: 15391905 / Geoff Gear  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal for land in Send Hill to be used for 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches. Again this is new proposal which has not been previously consulted upon.

This area has permanent Green Belt status and the beautiful area would be spoilt by any development. The existing site is currently vented as it has unsafe landfill waste and should not be used. The 2 travellers pitches are also inappropriate because the narrow single track lane would provide insufficient access to the site with their large vehicles, especially the access from the bend on Potters Lane which is extremely dangerous!

There is not the need for such a large amount of housing as GBC has suggested. I realise that there is a need for housing but not to the detriment of losing Green Belt, congested roads, over-subscribed schools and doctors. The South East of England is ready a highly populated area.

In my opinion, these developments SHOULDN'T be approved and NOT be allowed o go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2464  Respondent: 15398593 / Kirsten Collins  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of this site for development in the local plan. This site is a new proposal that was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted on previously. This is a beautiful area of countryside that would be
harmed by development and it fully justifies its current Green Belt designation. The subsoil in this area contains
documented unsafe landfill waste which is currently vented, further calling into question its suitability for development.
The roads in this area are occasionally narrow single track country roads and so access to this site would be restricted,
calling into question the logic of providing 2 Travellers’ pitches here.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2519  Respondent: 15400897 / Alison Parkinson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill. This is already an extremely dangerous
lane as my husband knows to his cost having had his car written off when he turned out at the bottom of the road any
more traffic here would make it an accident BLACK SPOT - please don't do it!!!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2604  Respondent: 15408545 / Michael J Lewis  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

I refer to latest addition to the local plan for Send's future development. This site would obviously be built on Green Belt
Land which is totally unsuitable for this area.

I object for the following reasons-

1. I object to - Send Hill is a very narrow lane and where this site will be there is absolutely there is no room for
vehicles to pass each other, therefore the road would have to be widened, at a considerable cost, to enable lorries
and caravans to go back and forth on this site. The sewage in Send Hill has always been a problem with excess
effluence, there is considerable back up so our properties has to be cleaned out on a regular basis, this will only
be exacerbated by any additional properties.

1. I object to - The private owner part of this development which is opposite our property has become a haven for
wildlife with deer and there young, badgers, rabbits, bees, owls, and various species of birds

1. I object to - When this piece of land was sold to the present owner there was a Covenant that a corner of this plot
should not be disturbed as it was used as a dog and pet building on this plot surely is breaking the lease.

1. The GBC area of this development has been used for many years for recreation, children and dog

1. I object to - Previously the land was used and a waste This infill was extremely toxic and has been vented over a
period of time. If building was to take place, surely this would disturb any existing toxicity present which could
result in serious problems!

1. The Cemetery enlargement in Send Hill has now been offered to all denominations which will increase both
traffic and parking problems adding yet more chaos from your proposed development If you take in
consideration the traffic from schools and their latest rebuilds, this will increase the traffic problems. By the
riding stables on Send Hill the road gets even narrower and very dangerous leading into Potters

I object to the proposed alterations to the Local Plan site- for the following reasons.

I object to - The proposals are being built on what was green belt and seems extremely underhand by moving the green
belt boundary lines. Tills goes against the Sectary of State guide lines and the Government planning Minister.

A letter received from Sir Paul Beresford in July 2014, stated that only in exceptional circumstances could properties be
built on green belt land. This proposal could be built on brown fields and do not show special reasons for green belt
building.

The Send Hill development is in a complete residential area and could not cope with a increase in traffic, including
commercial lorries being used by travellers.

A copy of this letter is being sent to the Secretary of State, Ministry of Planning and our local Member of Parliament and
Prime Minister, David Cameron.

I want my comments to be seen by the inspector.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I also object to the development of 40 houses and 2 Travellers Pitches at Send Hill. Again, this is an area which has already come under planning proposals and residents have already spent time trying to explain the problems. Not only would this spoil a beautiful area of Green Belt but it is unsuitable for development for many reasons. It has no suitable vehicle access as Send Hill is a narrow residential lane which cannot support further traffic and has poor junctions at both ends. The junction with the A247 only copes on the basis that traffic from and to Send Hill is light. At both ends of the school day, when traffic is higher, I would divert down Potters Lane and along Send Rd rather than try to use the junction of Send Hill and the A247. It is impossible to pass and extremely dangerous for the children arriving and leaving school. If it is that bad already, how could we support more? Additionally, the other end of Send Hill, where it joins Potters Lane is already extremely hazardous. It is a single passing bending section, accessing onto a bend of Potters Lane, with very limited visibility. My daughter’s driving instructor advised her to stop at the junction of Send Hill and Potters Lane and wind down the window, whatever the weather, so that she has some chance of hearing whether there is any traffic approaching from either direction of Potters Lane as it is impossible to see traffic coming. This junction cannot support higher levels of traffic.

In addition, development here would be sighted on an area where the subsoil has previously been documented as containing unsafe landfill waste. The local plan is flawed in its reference to this area as it describes it as a quarry whereas it was a landfill site “refuse tip” prior to a time when proper licensing/registration was required and predating the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. GBC has recognised this problem, stated it has “areas of potentially contaminative industrial activities”, installed gas monitoring wells and recorded methane gas discharge. I therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be a health hazard. The area is also vulnerable to flooding. A Wasteland Solutions environmental report on Send Hill dated March 2004 gave evidence of past ponding of water in the excavated area, the Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005 identified that changes to the proposed site could cause potential ground water vulnerability to properties and you only need to walk in the area to see how susceptible it is. Further development would disturb the water table and increase risk of flooding in the area. The recent death of a child as a result of seepage of contaminated ground following flooding prove that developing any such sites is a danger to health in addition to the problems of flooding.

It would be totally unacceptable to offer such an area for a Travellers’ pitch. The Travellers would also be being located in an area where other elements of the infrastructure, such as schools, doctors (it is already almost impossible to get a doctor’s appointment in an acceptable time scale, we have resorted on many occasions to the walk-in centre in Woking) and other services, would not support their needs.

My additional objection to this proposal lies in the fact that the Traveller Accommodation Assessment research does not seem genuine as the research is dated June-July 2012, by Mill Field Services, but this market research company was dissolved in January 2011 according to the government companies’ site.

I also feel very strongly that this is an area of nature reserve nearby. I object on these grounds as we shouldn’t be endangering such areas, especially when there is no justification for the development. Unfortunately such considerations do not seem to carry the importance that they should but, alongside all the other reasons, they should add any necessary further weight to the objection.

I do feel that I cannot express sufficiently strongly how I feel about this new plan and the objections to it. If it remains in its current form, it will be looked on with regret, as the moment when this area of our beautiful country, which we thought we had saved by the imposition of the Green Belt, was irrevocably destroyed for future generations.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Policy A44 – I strongly object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill. The narrow country lane (Send Hill) would not cope with any additional traffic. It is narrow and already busy with traffic to the cemetery (which has recently been extended). The junction at the bottom of Send Hill with Potters Lane is very dangerous due to speeding traffic off of the A3. Any more traffic would make it even more hazardous. It is an inappropriate location for 40 houses because the road is narrow and single access. Also the soil of the proposed site contains documented unsafe landfill waste registered by GBC. The land is totally unsuitable for dwellings and traveller pitches. I believe the unsafe landfill will be harmful to health of any home owners. Any development there would spoil a high amenity area set in beautiful countryside. The area is used for recreational activities such as walking and would be greatly missed by locals.

Send will not be able to cope with the proposed developments. St Bedes C/E School will shortly be demolished. Currently a new school is being built in the grounds of Send First School. The new infant/middle school when complete will not be able to cope with a large influx of children. There does not seem to be any long term planning in line with GBC proposals.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7598  Respondent: 15423073 / Joanna McNamara

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?  ( ), is Sound?  ( ), is Legally Compliant?  ( )

Lastly, I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill. This site is located down a narrow single width road. Additional traffic and caravans should not be encouraged to travel down it. The site also has unsafe landfill waste in the subsoil as registered with Guildford Borough Council.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2800  Respondent: 15426113 / Sarah Ross

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?  ( ), is Sound?  ( ), is Legally Compliant?  ( )

I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 traveller’s pitches at Send Hill. There is insufficient access and I understand that there is unsafe landfill waste in this land. This development would ruin the lovely countryside in that area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2831  Respondent: 15426849 / Ian Shaw

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?  ( ), is Sound?  ( ), is Legally Compliant?  ( )

1.
I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill. It is an inappropriate location as
the narrow single country road provides insufficient access. Any development there will encroach on the beautiful amenity countryside setting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2852  Respondent: 15427329 / Christina Shaw  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill. It is an inappropriate location as the narrow single country road provides insufficient access. Any development there will encroach on the beautiful amenity countryside setting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2870  Respondent: 15427937 / Elizabeth Lawes  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I Object;
This is my strongest objection. To 40 houses (Maybe) but two travellers sites at Send Hill. I am terrified, already travellers are going up and down the narrow lane VERY VERY fast on their house and trap. [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it]. The road is too narrow and dangerous. My house would lose value and I would HAVE to install major security metal fencing. [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it] I would seriously think of moving out of the area. I am terrified already, I very very rarely see a police car patrolling the lane as it is.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2908  Respondent: 15429985 / Jennifer Slade  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to POLICY A 444.1.9 ha LAND WEST OF WINDS RIDGE AND SEND HILL which has designated the development of 40 homes and 2 Travellers' Pitches. This site is NEW and was NOT included in the Regulation 18 Draft and has not been consulted upon previously. Development for housing is inappropriate due to its permanent Green Belt status and it is a Green Belt amenity within an area of natural beauty which would be totally
destroyed by development. The site contains documented contaminated land which is vented. The site of the proposed Travellers' Pitches can only be accessed via a narrow single track country road, which makes access very limited and thus unsuitable for development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2931  Respondent: 15430945 / Rosalind Molesworth  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to A44 the development of the area west of Send Hill Road which is not suitable to take increased traffic, it is not wide enough for two lanes of traffic as is evident by the lack of the middle white line. South of Send Hill is Potters lane which is already over used and is a frequent road with incidents where cars coming of the A3 cut through maintaining the speed they where traveling on the A3 and soon getting to the small number of houses and the blind corner where they meet an oncoming vehicle on a lane wide enough for a single car only. This is made worse in the winter months where the particular area is prone to flooding and the formation of ice frequently.

Further objection under A44 is that this is currently Green Belt and has an existing abundance of plant and wild life, this development will destroy this area with little or no regards to the eco system! The plan states “Green corridors and linkages to habitats outside of the site” where as in fact the plan removes the eco system habitats so hardly a linkage. The green belt beyond the site is predominantly farm land and not natural habitat.

I also object under A44 that requires “Sensitive design at site boundaries that has significant regard to the transition from village to greenfield” this only affects the boundary development whereas as the complete development will not be in keeping with the existing Village. As I personally have been rejected twice a conversion on my home for this very fact despite general support from the majority of my neighbours.

Under A44 there is a stated evidence of a quarry, but no mention that this was actually more recently used as a land fill, including the disposal of Asbestos! Therefore what precautions are taken into account for this? Development on a previous land fill should be considered very carefully. I understand that the area has been monitored recently and considered safe, however a major development would drastically affect this. The dumping here predates the 1999 EU landfall directive regulations.

Also the area under A44 one of the few areas locally for dog walking with access both via Send Hill and a foot path to the village, developing this will remove one of the few remaining places people within send can let their dog roam free.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2997  Respondent: 15433473 / Kay Webb  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A44 which would see 40 homes and two travellers' pitches on land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill. This is also a new site and therefore has not been consulted on previously. Once again this is precious Green Belt land, which also contains unsafe vented landfill. Access to this site is via a narrow lane, which could never take the increase in traffic which this development would create.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
| Comment ID: PSLPS16/6197  Respondent: 15434305 / Antonia Phillips  Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |
| I object, to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers’ pitches on Send Hill, opposite Send Cemetery. The narrow country road does not provide sufficient access, making this an inappropriate location to develop. The subsoil of the proposed site contains documented unsafe landfill waste, as registered with Guildford Borough Council. Guildford Borough Council has already installed gas monitoring wells on the site, since July 2000; one well recorded methane gas discharge. An environmental report by Wasteland Solutions, from March 2004, found evidence of past ponding of water in the excavated area, so any development could disturb the water table and increase the risk of flooding to nearby properties, including my home. As this area is already suffering from congestion, particularly at school times, the proposed number of houses will potentially result on an increase of unnecessary traffic, pollution and noise. Any type of development would spoil an area of natural beauty, resulting in the destruction of a valuable and irreplaceable natural habitat. |
| What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? |
| Attached documents: |

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/3093  Respondent: 15437089 / Jamie Manester  Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |
| 40 houses & 2 traveller pitches - again, I object! It is absurd given that Send Hill Road is totally unsuitable; there is not sufficient access, it's already unable to support increased traffic levels. Increased pollution would be detrimental to the residents and environment (not to mention the much needed peaceful ambience of the cemetery), safety to residents would be comprised, and the negative impact to services like the local school and doctors would be significant, need I say more! |
| What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? |
| Attached documents: |

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/3156  Respondent: 15440161 / Linda Daniell  Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |
| I object to policy A44 and the building of 40 homes and 2 travellers pitches. As a resident of Potters Lane, I have had first hand experience of the hazardous junction from Send Hill onto Potters Lane. Increasing the population will make this more dangerous. Visibility is very poor when turning right from Send Hill onto Potters Lane and more traffic will increase the risk to drivers lives. A44 |
| What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? |
| Attached documents: |
Policy A44. 1.9. ha land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill designated for 4- homes and 2 travellers pitches. This has not been consulted upon. The subsoil contains documented unsafe landfill waste and the site is inappropriate due to the narrow country road, with insufficient access to the site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

With respect to the site numbered A44 in the revised draft local plan.

I would like to object to the inclusion of this site in the draft local plan for the following reasons:

1. The number of houses needed in the Borough was changed between the first and second issues of the draft plan indicating that there is considerable uncertainty in this figure and the basis and method of calculation. In view of the recent EU referendum vote and its impact on future immigration, the number of houses required is likely to reduce further. With smaller house numbers the need for any loss of the Greenbelt should be reassessed as 'special circumstances' necessary for reclassification have not been established.
2. This site was introduced at the last minute and there has been insufficient time for consultation before its inclusion in the draft plan.
3. This development will add to the disproportionate burden on the north east of the Borough.
4. There is a question as to the suitability of the land for building purposes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill. Due to the subsoil of the proposed site containing documented unsafe landfill waster registered at GBC.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3225  Respondent: 15442561 / Tegan Meredith  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill. Due to the subsoil of the proposed site containing documented unsafe landfill waster registered at GBC.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3238</th>
<th>Respondent: 15442785 / Tammy Hoar</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill as it contains unsafe land fill waste and is in the middle of the beautiful Green Belt which should be conserved. The road to this area is of single width and totally unsuitable for regular heavy traffic. A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3262</th>
<th>Respondent: 15443265 / C Knaggs</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill. It is an inappropriate location because the narrow width single access country road provides insufficient access. The subsoil of the proposed site contains documented unsafe landfill waste registered at GBC. Any development there would spoil a high amenity area set in beautiful countryside. For more detailed lines of objection, and a flyer specifically on this site, please contact Send Hill resident [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3275</th>
<th>Respondent: 15445729 / Daren Aris</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the development at Send Hill because of the narrow lanes and single access country roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3295</td>
<td>Respondent: 15446561 / Peter Hoar</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers’ pitches at Send Hill. Again planners seem to have no conception of the local roads ans it would again precious Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3317</th>
<th>Respondent: 15447713 / John Bassett-Smith</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We strongly object to this development as a pledge to protect the Green Belt is a pledge which must be honoured.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The residents of Send Hill have built up our community for years by taking an interest. This is about to be demolished if your development is to take place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it] and you will have to live with the added problems as residents &quot;pull up their drawbridge&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The area will loose its attraction and and change character in a very short time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3321</th>
<th>Respondent: 15447873 / Karen Robinson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF 40 HOUSES AND 2 TRAVELLER’S PITCHES AT SEND HILL.Again very narrow access that can barely take a single car let alone traveller caravans and lorries.This road particularly the steep downhill part into Potters Lane would be lethal from a traffic point of view for cyclists,walkers ,motorists and children walking to schools and busses.It would also put pressure on wildlife being in close proximity to the River Wey with commensurate increase in pollution etc. Additionally is the council actually aware of the road width here in places it is not much more than 2 metres wide.It will be impossible for the traveller community to get their caravans and trucks along this lane.This has not been thought out in a detailed way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3371</th>
<th>Respondent: 15448897 / Ruth Brothwell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 traveller pitches at Send Hill. It is an inappropriate location because of the narrow width single access country road providing insufficient access - please see below for further details on traffic issues. The subsoil of the proposed site contains documented unsafe landfill waste registered at GBC. Any development there would spoil beautiful and historic countryside including the ‘five manors of Send’ which are a matter of historic record.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3425  Respondent: 15449921 / James Herbst  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill. It is an inappropriate location as a narrow width single access country road. Any development there would spoil a high amenity area set in beautiful countryside. For more detailed lines of rejection please contact Send Hill resident [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998].

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3440  Respondent: 15450113 / Louise Lawton  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Send Hill New Housing: 40 x houses and 2 x traveller pitches on Send Hill, which is known as highly desirable prime semirural and much sought after location, is the most unbelievable part of the plan. It is a dangerous road at the best of times with our road at the end where you propose building housing narrowing to a single track with a lethal blind corner. Also it would increase traffic to an unacceptable level. I strongly object.

Where to build If you need to build new properties, place them next 10 the A3 (not on the green belt). People should be grateful for a roof over their head albeit not in a prime location like Send Hill that I spent many many years working hard to afford.

Lastly, the properties you are proposing would have an immediate impact on our house values, so compensation would be sought should the plan go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3566  Respondent: 15454977 / Graham Hook  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 traveller pitches at Send Hill, this again is an inappropriate location as the roads leading to it are narrow and of single width which would not provide adequate access. The site is also an old landfill site which to deemed to be unsafe.

An article on the local radio recently stated that Surrey council had identified a significant shortfall in the number of school places, thousands! Over the coming years where are all the new children be going to go to school, not to mention over stretched doctors, hospitals etc etc as the whole area seems to be awash with new proposed developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill being developed as this is a new proposal and has not been consulted upon. There is a school in the area and Send Hill becomes very congested as it is. Visitors to the cemetery should be allowed to do so in peace and quiet and two travelers’ pitches in this area would be entirely inappropriate as there would be insufficient access to the site along a very narrow single track country road. The subsoil on the site also contains documented unsafe landfill waste registered at GBC.

I object to the proposed developments on the grounds that they are excessive, would generate hazardous and heavy traffic in the area and encroach on Green Belt land.

I urge you to reconsider and moderate any plans you are proposing to be in keeping with existing amenities. Development should be of moderate density and industrial space should be at Slyfield if it is needed. Please do not cause infrastructure overload. Please confirm that you have received my communication.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
With respect to Policy A44, 19a Land West Of Winds Ridge and Send Hill:

1. I Object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that Send is in Green Belt and should remain so forever.

1. I Object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the land has been identified as an old landfill site with potential contamination from industrial activities. Development of this site would disturb unknown contaminants exposing residents and workers to unknown and necessary health risks.

1. I Object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the road can not take the increased traffic flow, both for construction and for additional residents. Send Hill is a narrow road where ANY on street parking introduces unacceptable risks. The proposed development is also near the narrower end with single track blind corners and a high risk T-junction with Potters Lane.

1. I Object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that it will severely impact the adjacent nature reserve.

1. I Object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the open land and space would be lost. Current pathways would loose the feel of open countryside negatively impacting residents and visitors who frequent the local footpaths.

1. I Object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the Traveller Accommodation Assessment research was reportedly undertaken by Mill Field Services in June/July 2012 when the company was dissolved in January 2011. Travellers pitches are quite simply not desired or supported by residents.

1. I Object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the open feel of the road and area will be unacceptably reduced. A recent planning application to build two houses in place of one was refused for this very reason. So how is building an additional 40 houses now acceptable? In short - it is not.

10. I Object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the high level of disruption, noise pollution and air pollution for local residents of such a large construction project is unnecessary and unacceptable.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3883  **Respondent:** 15462561 / D B Houghton  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Reference the proposed building on the site opposite Winds Reach in Send I would like to express my opposition to this on the following grounds

1) As you know this is an old rubbish tip and as far as I know no one knows what is there however we do know that whatever it was needs vents

As point of interest I have not seen any ground based insects since we got here some 14 years ago!

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4001  **Respondent:** 15468705 / Pauline East  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Reference the proposed building on the site opposite Winds Reach in Send I would like to express my opposition to this on the following grounds

1) As you know this is an old rubbish tip and as far as I know no one knows what is there however we do know that whatever it was needs vents

As point of interest I have not seen any ground based insects since we got here some 14 years ago!

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill there is insufficient access and it would spoil a high amenity area in beautiful countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4002  Respondent: 15468769 / David Turner  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy Land West of Winds Ridge and Send Hill – I am horrified to see this included in the plan.

1. It's NOT included in the regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted upon previ
2. Housing development is not lawful due to this area's permanent Green Belt status and high quality countryside which is much loved by dog walkers, children and local
3. The narrow width single track lane cannot cope with HGV lorries and vans and particularly will not provide access for mobile homes units. This lane is very much appreciated by local residents.
4. Send Hill, by its nature, provides a much loved country environment, it would be a catastrophe if Guildford Borough Council decide to wipe this out by placing traveller pitches and housing in this area.
5. The proposed change to this recreational area will damage local wildlife including owls, pheasants, deer, geese, foxes and bi

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4006  Respondent: 15468833 / Zoe Kollov  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I completely object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send hill. The roads are not appropriate to take further traffic due to the twisty tight nature and single width providing dangerous access. There is also unsafe landfill below the site. There must be brownfield sites that can accommodate such requirements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4018  Respondent: 15468961 / Richard Bickerton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to object to the proposed development on land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill in Send, Surrey on the following grounds:

1) Very dangerous access from Potters lane.
I have lived in Church lane for nearly 30 years and use this junction everyday. Personally, I always turn left as I approach Potters lane from Send Hill. It is extremely dangerous to either turn right or to cross straight over to Church lane. If traffic increases due to the proposed development then a fatal accident is surely inevitable.

2) New Proposal.

This policy A44 appears to be a new site proposal that has not been consulted upon previously. I cannot think of a less appropriate site given the narrow and dangerous access to the whole site and if it had been consulted fully then I am sure that the inadequacy of the access would have been self evident.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4022  Respondent: 15468993 / Nicholas Brown  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill. Unsafe landfill presently occupies the site and access is along a narrow single width access road. This is not an appropriate site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4038  Respondent: 15469217 / L.Y. Jolliffe  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of 40 houses and travellers’ pitches at Send Hill. This proposal is probably the most unsuitable of all has been 'sneaked in' at virtually the last minute as if it has little significance. WRONG. Send Hill is a beautiful country lane within the Green Belt much loved by environmentalists, residents, local people and visitors to the area. At weekends, many cyclists enjoy their recreation riding along here in a fairly safe, part single track road leading through to open countryside, the historic church and nearby river Wey. This lane cannot support increased traffic, has extremely limited parking and insufficient access for this development. The latter end of the road is very narrow approaching the junction with Potters Lane [this end was a private road although now adopted by the council. The residents however still own the subsoil]. The identified site is a landfill, with the subsoil contaminated with toxicity dangerous to health. It is also subject to surface flooding. If this site is disturbed, by building work and foundations being laid, not only will the housing be at risk, but has potential of increased surface flooding, spreading pollutants to existing properties.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4028  Respondent: 15469313 / Paddy Bickerton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Objection to Policy A44. 1.9ha Land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill

I object to the proposed development on land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill in Send, Surrey because I have lived in Church Lane, off Porters Lane for nearly 30 years and over this period there have been numerous accidents from vehicles coming down Send Hill into Potters Lane. Cars travel very fast along Potters Lane and there is a blind spot when turning right out of Send Hill, at Potters Lane. This has caused accidents. Evidence of accidents, apart from screeching breaks, is damage to the gate on the corner and hedges. Being aware of these facts I always turn left out of Send Hill and u-turn at Vicarage Lane to then enter Church Lane. If the proposed development goes ahead I fear that the heavier traffic is very likely to cause a death at that junction.

Send Hill is a narrow road at both ends. I therefore strongly object to the proposed buildings and travellers pitches west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill because of the danger of extra traffic on this narrow road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4082  **Respondent:** 15471489 / P Gilby  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of 40 houses and two travellers pitches at Send Hill

Access is narrow, a blind junction at one end with potters lane at the bottom of a steep single lane hill. The other end of Send Hill is often congested with school traffic. The site is on an old landfill which is known to contain toxic waste. This is an inappropriate location in the quiet English countryside close to the final resting place of past residents of the Village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4090  **Respondent:** 15472833 / Lorraine Ozanne  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of 40 houses and two travellers pitches at Send Hill – again there is insufficient access and this development would spoil the countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4120  **Respondent:** 15473473 / Gordon Prosser  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A44 - there has been no previous consultation on such a proposal.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4224  **Respondent:** 15478145 / P. A. Key  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Also to allow Policy A44 1.9 to go ahead, even though there is documented evidence that the subsoil here is unsafe and by adding this site which was not included in the regulation 18 draft which was not consulted on previously is a disgrace and I strongly object.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4568  **Respondent:** 15487297 / L.A. Crane  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to policy A44 which would see 40 homes and two travellers' pitches on land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill. This was again a NEW site NOT included in 18 draft and therefore has NOT been consulted on previously. Once again this is Green Belt land partly containing unsafe landfill. Access is by a narrow lane which could never take the volume of traffic that would ensue from travellers' pitches.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4570  **Respondent:** 15487297 / L.A. Crane  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the fact that the Local Plan takes no account of schools, doctors surgeries and roads that are already operating at full capacity. Another 4000 houses in this area with a conservative estimate of a further 8000 cars would be catastrophic.

I OBJECT to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.

I OBJECT to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the proposed number of houses potentially could result in 92 extra cars in Send Hill which is already suffering from congestion particularly at school run time.

I OBJECT to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that a wasteland solutions environmental report on Send Hill dated March 2004 gave evidence of past ponding of water in the excavated area. Further development would disturb water table and increase risk of flooding to my property.
I OBJECT to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the proposed development site (A44) was used as OBC registered landfill site, not a quarry as listed as reference LLA 2081 in the local plan.

I OBJECT to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the 1963-8 Ordnance Survey maps of the proposed site mark it as "refuse and slag heap". It is therefore unsuitable for such a development on health reasons.

I OBJECT to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the Traveller Accommodation Assessment research, purported to have been undertaken in June-July 2012 by Mill Field Services, cannot be the case. The Sittingbourne based market research company was dissolved in January 2011 according to the government companies site.

I OBJECT to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that both Envirossearch report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004 concludes "potentially contaminative industrial sites identified from analysis" of Ordnance survey maps.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4675  Respondent: 15495041 / J D Clarkson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The proposal is to build 400 new homes in Send with no provision for the infrastructure that will be required to support it (for example schools, health care facilities etc.). Send is a small village and will be swamped by such a development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4731  Respondent: 15495329 / Michelle Burton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 Travellers' pitches at Send Hill. It is an inappropriate location because the narrow width single access country road provides insufficient access. The subsoil of the proposed site contains documented unsafe landfill waste registered at GBC. Any development there would spoil a high amenity area set in beautiful countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7868  Respondent: 15502433 / Jill Murphy  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 Travellers' pitches at Send Hill. A totally inappropriate location with very narrow Roads with single tack roads with insufficient access. The subsoil here contains documented unsafe landfill waste registered at GBC. This development would spoil a high amenity area set in beautiful countryside.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5244  Respondent: 15504129 / Simon Hurdle  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A44 – Land West of Winds Ridge, Send Hill

I object – Land in Green Belt; resulting traffic using Send Hill which has single track road in one direction and the busiest junction in the village in the other, adding further pressure to traffic. There are concerns over the safety of landfill waste in the ground.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5284  Respondent: 15504833 / Robert Lynch  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill. It would also degrade a site of natural beauty.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5304  Respondent: 15504993 / Harry Eke  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I PARTICULARLY OBJECT to the proposal in Policy A44 of the local plan Land West of Winds Ridge and Send Hill on the grounds that:

- The site is not large enough for the proposed use.
- The siting of two travellers pitches in Send Hill will be detrimental to both Send Hill and the Send/Ripley areas with house values and people’s desire to move into the area adversely affected.
- Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.
- Send is in green belt. The proposed inset is inappropriate due to its permanent green belt status and would be spoilt by development.
- The existing road and parking infrastructure is already inadequate or under pressure and could worsen with the planned development, reducing quality of life.
- Too many houses are proposed to Send/ Send Marsh are and the impact on traffic congestion and local services would be unacceptable.
The proposed number of houses potentially could result in 92 extra cars in Send Hill which is already suffering from congestion particularly at school run time.

This would cause loss of village identity, be detrimental to the community and increased flood risk.

A Wasteland Solutions environmental report on Send Hill dated March 2004 gave evidence of past ponding of water in the excavated area. Further development would disturb water table and increase risk of flooding to properties.

GBC has installed gas monitoring wells on site since July 2000. One well recording methane gas discharge.

Both the Envirosearch Report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004 and historical map data and information from GBC has identified site as landfill and has “areas of potentially contaminative industrial activities”. Development of this site would be a health hazard.

The Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005-Identifies proposed site as a local authorised landfill site as licences under Part II of Environmental protection Act 1990. The proposed site is not a quarry as specified in the GBC Local Plan. And is therefore not suitable for the proposed usage. It also Identifies proposed site as potentially contaminative industrial land. With usage of “Heap and unknown constituents”. This causes concern as to what it does contain and dangers if disturbed.

Overall, I OBJECT to the Local Plan. I would like these comments to be seen and considered by a planning inspector.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5319  Respondent: 15505313 / Samantha J S Perry  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill.

The narrow width single access road provides insufficient access and is inappropriate. Furthermore, the subsoil of the proposed site contains unsafe landfill waste that has been documented and registered at the GBC. This high amenity area set in beautiful countryside should not be lost by unnecessary development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5398  Respondent: 15506369 / Sheila Jennings-Giles  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to policy A44 which would see 40 homes and two travellers' pitches on land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill. This was again a NEW site NOT included in 18 draft and therefore has NOT been consulted on previously. Once again this is Green Belt land partly containing unsafe landfill. Access is by a narrow lane which could never take the volume of traffic that would ensue from traveller's pitches.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5551  Respondent: 15507649 / Nick Turner  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
I object to policy A44 Send Hill

There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

The proposed development is not sustainable because of poor infrastructure. Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site for travellers or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.

The site is a high quality green belt amenity area within beautiful surrounding countryside and would be spoilt by the development.

A Wasteland Solutions environmental report on Send Hill dated March 2004 gave evidence of past ponding of water in the excavated area. Further development would disturb the water table and increase risk of flooding to surrounding properties.

The site was used as a GBC registered landfill site and shown on the 1963-8 Ordnance Survey maps as ‘refuse and slag heap’. It is therefore unsuitable for such a development on health reasons. There is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials, and GBC has installed gas monitoring wells on site since July 2000. Methane gas discharge has been recorded making the development of this site a health hazard.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT, This area may have started off as a quarry but it became a landfill site pre EU Landfill Directive with type of waste not identified, Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005-Identifies the proposed site as GBC recorded landfill site Ref GU/11/LLC. This area is also shown on a number of Ordnance Survey Maps as refuse tip. The Envirossearch Report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004 and historical map data and information from GBC has identified site as landfill and has ‘areas of potentially contaminative industrial activities’ it would be far better to leave the site undisturbed. Any development of the site would add an extra 80 cars on the roads of Send producing addition congestion.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill. Already there is too much traffic travelling at speed along Potters Lane which has resulted in the deaths of numerous domestic pets and near misses by those on foot or on push bikes. By building on Send Hill the problem would be exacerbated. The site is contaminated as it is full of unsafe landfill which has been documented and there should be a duty of care by the builders to ensure they are offering
homes for sale on safe land. This is in area of natural beauty and by building on this site the natural beauty will be destroyed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5792  Respondent: 15574497 / Ann Murray  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 traveller pitches at Send Hill. This is an inappropriate location being on the site of landfill waste. It is registered with Guildford Borough Council as containing unsafe waste. Send Hill, at that point, is a single track road. The exit on to Potters Lane is a blind corner. This part of Potters Lane is at National Speed Limit (60 mph). This makes this junction very dangerous.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5812  Respondent: 15575137 / Charlotte Procter  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I OBJECT to 40 houses being developed at Send Hill and 2 travelers pitches being developed. This is an inappropriate location as the access would be problematic from the narrow width, single access road. Also the subsoil of the proposed site contains documented unsafe landfill waste registered by the GBC.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5849  Respondent: 15575617 / Pete Killingley  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the 40 houses and 2 traveller’s pitches at Send Hill. I have to drive along this road every day, and it is already a regular occurrence for traffic to be blocked in both directions as it is so narrow, with sharp bends on a steep hill. Often cars have to reverse to let others through, or sometimes even lorries. The idea to increase the number of houses here must have been suggested by someone who has never driven along here, or doesn’t know the village

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5857  Respondent: 15575713 / Sophie Killingley  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
I object to the 40 houses and 2 traveller’s pitches at Send Hill. I have to drive along this road every day, and it is already a regular occurrence for traffic to be blocked in both directions as it is so narrow, with sharp bends on a steep hill. Often cars have to reverse to let others through, or sometimes even lorries. The idea to increase the number of houses here must have been suggested by someone who has never driven along here, or doesn’t know the village!!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill. The roads are not appropriate to take further traffic due to the twisty tight nature and single width providing dangerous access. There is also unsafe landfill below the site. There must be brownfield sites that can accommodate such requirements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill. Proposal A 44.

The proposed development is completely inappropriate in a high amenity area.

I find it unbelievable that the council would even begin to contemplate such a development. In my time of living in Send this was an active rubbish tip, that the council have registered as containing unsafe waste, and currently has vent pipes to disperse the gas generated from within.

A few years ago, alongside the proposed site, individual plots of land were sold off at auction and the council made it known that planning was unlikely to be available in the "foreseeable future". My how times change.

The access road is of very poor quality, it being a single track road descending quite sharply to the junction with Potters Lane.

There are regularly difficulties encountered by traffic meeting half way up the hill.

Historically it is an accident black spot as the junction with Potters Lane is on a hidden bend.

This site has never formed part of any discussions or consultations with residents over planning matters and may be part of the councils "Rural exception homes plan" as Send and East Horsley have been selected as suitable. (ref 4.2.47)

I wish these comments to be passed to the planning inspector who will decide.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I OBJECT to the planned development for houses and two travellers’ pitches on Send Hill. The land here has unsafe landfill waste registered with Guildford Borough Council so shouldn’t be built on! Also the lanes leading to it are too narrow for extra traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6106  Respondent: 15584097 / George Gervasio  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to the planned development sites at Send Hill. The building of 40 houses and two travellers’ pitches at Send Hill should not be allowed to go ahead because this land contains documented unsafe land fill waste in it. Additionally, the roads in this area are single track and too narrow to provide sufficient access.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6143  Respondent: 15585057 / Alison Warwick  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Send, Ripley and Burnt Common proposed developments.

I object to policy a44 land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill for 40 homes and 2 travellers pitches. This local amenity is well used by the local community and is also an old landfill site. It has green belt status and a beautiful area of countryside would be spoilt by any development. Any disturbance of this old landfill site is potentially dangerous.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6157  Respondent: 15585249 / Joe Eke  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
The site is not large enough for the proposed use.

The siting of two travellers pitches in Send Hill will be detrimental to both Send Hill and the Send/Ripley areas with house values and people’s desire to move into the area adversely affected.

Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.

Send is in green belt. The proposed inset is inappropriate due to its permanent green belt status and would be spoilt by development.

The existing road and parking infrastructure is already inadequate or under pressure and could worsen with the planned development, reducing quality of life.

Too many houses are proposed to Send/ Send Marsh are and the impact on traffic congestion and local services would be unacceptable.

The proposed number of houses potentially could result in 92 extra cars in Send Hill which is already suffering from congestion particularly at school run time.

This would cause loss of village identity, be detrimental to the community and increased flood risk.

A Wasteland Solutions environmental report on Send Hill dated March 2004 gave evidence of past ponding of water in the excavated area. Further development would disturb water table and increase risk of flooding to properties.

GBC has installed gas monitoring wells on site since July 2000. One well recording methane gas discharge.

Both the Envirosearch Report RS1100201_1_1 dated 17th February 2004 and historical map data and information from GBC has identified site as landfill and has “areas of potentially contaminative industrial activities”. Development of this site would be a health hazard.

The Southern County Searches (Sitescope Ltd) report E.2978.SN_HCP dated 5th January 2005 Identifies proposed site as a local authorised landfill site as licences under Part II of Environmental protection Act 1990. The proposed site is not a quarry as specified in the GBC Local Plan. And is therefore not suitable for the proposed usage. It also identifies proposed site as potentially contaminative industrial land. With usage of "Heap and unknown constituents". This causes concern as to what it does contain and dangers if disturbed

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6235  Respondent: 15587073 / Mark Sweeting  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? (

I would like to object to the inclusion of this site in the draft local plan for the following reasons:

1. The number of houses needed in the Borough was changed between the first and second issues of the draft plan indicating that there is considerable uncertainty in this figure and the basis and method of calculation. In view of the recent EU referendum vote and its impact on future immigration, the number of houses required is likely to reduce further.

   With smaller house numbers the need for any loss of the Greenbelt should be reassessed as 'special circumstances' necessary for recategorisation have not been established.

2. This site was introduced at the last minute and there has been insufficient time for consultation before its inclusion in the draft plan.

3. This development will add to the disproportionate burden on the north east of the Borough.

4. There is a question as to the suitability of the land for building purposes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6251  Respondent: 15587169 / Sylvia Denison  Agent:
Send Hill development

I object to the development of another 40 houses and 2 traveller site pitches on this site. The area is a popular beauty area, which fits the Green Belt designation. Access for the new residents would be via a very narrow single track road, again impacting on traffic passing through send villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

It is evident that Guildford Borough Council's extraordinary determination to contravene National Planning Policy Framework for Green Belt protection remains at the forefront of your operations, even after the objections raised by Sir Paul Beresford MP back in 2014 which highlighted the entirely erroneous beginnings of the Local Plan and the many examples of poor practice carried out by GBC in their initiation of the process. GBC will, therefore, accept that the Local Plan was initiated under entirely misguided circumstances, without appropriate consultation and, as such, that the entire process is flawed and has been tainted by chronic mismanagement from the outset. Unfortunately, lack of consultation has continued with the recent addition of policy A43a - the proposed new A3 slip roads, which have not been properly appraised and only recently added. For example, in the 11th May review of the draft Proposed Submission Local Plan (reviewed by Guildford Council Executive), it is notable that Appendix C does not contain any reference to the need for a new A3 slip road at A247 Clandon Road. The first reference made to it is on May 24th (Appendix C) when considered as part of the draft Local Plan by the Full Council. Perhaps light can be shed as to why it was only on May 24th that the need was identified for these new slip roads, when this planning process began in October 2013? Such an action is one of two things: last-minute, in which case the decision has not been fully appraised and reviewed, or 'back door', whereby GBC is attempting to add in these proposed slip roads at the last-possible juncture so that they go unnoticed by members of the public. In either case, you will agree that this is poor process and will not stand up to further scrutiny.

To supplement the evidence of this catalogue of inappropriate procedure, I will refer you to the comprehensive document produced by Tibbalds Planning and Urban Design, appointed planning consultants acting on behalf of Send Parish Council, who have conducted a review in to the GBC Local Plan. I quote points 4.15 and 4.16 of their document in full here:

• The June 2016 Strategic Highways Assessment is a strategic transport modelling study that informs decision making surrounding the suitability of potential development sites and future highway mitigation proposals which have been identified. Appendix A sets out the strategic residential sites assessed as part of the highways assessment. The main residential site in Send is as follows: Ref. 2258 - Land south east of London Road Land south east of London Road, Send (part of B13-d) (known as Burnt Common) 260 homes and 140 flats.

It is unclear which site this refers to. Site 2258 appears to be a reference to the Feb 2016 LAA site reference for the ‘Land at Garlick's Arch’, however the site description appears to refer to the Land around Burnt Common Warehouse, formerly allocated as Site A43. The B13-d reference appears to relate to the January 2013 Green Belt and Countryside Review area around Burnt Common, not Garlick's Arch, which falls under land parcel B14 in this document. This shows a high degree of inconsistency in the appraisal and it is unclear which site is even appraised. It is possible that this was changed shortly before the Local Plan was released for consultation with the updated A43 and A43a allocations in May 2016, but it indicates that this piece of evidence is inconsistent and should be ascribed little weight.
This first issue is one of many examples of a lack of strategy in the GBC Local Plan, and evidence of a lack of information gathering. I restate my objection to policy A43a; it should be removed. Tibalds Planning and Urban Design identify that the proposed level of new housing in the Local Plan is greater than the identified need, and therefore constitutes "over-development". Equally, Tibalds Planning and Urban Design have identified an over-provision of land in the GBC Local Plan, which has failed to be justified by the Leader of the Council. Such a lack of justification and methodology is evidence of the points raised in my first paragraph, and references the "cavalier" approach that Sir Paul Beresford MP describes GBC having taken. In the same document, Tibalds Planning and Urban Design refer to the GBC Local Plan referencing the May 2014 Settlement Hierarchy Document, which the Local Plan cites as key evidence. I quote the following point made by Tibalds Planning and Urban Design in its entirety here:

- Paragraph 3.4.2 states that large rural villages are unsuitable for substantial growth but capable of accommodating an extension. Medium sized villages are unsuitable for substantial growth but capable of taking appropriate residential infill and development to meet local needs, defined as 'employment, amenity and community facilities as well as small scale infill housing and rural exception sites for affordable housing’. Send Parish consider the proposed level of development in Send Marsh / Burnt Common to represent substantial and inappropriate growth, contrary to this strategy for development.

As a four-year resident of Send I concur entirely with the Tibalds Planning and Urban Design report point 3.6, commenting on the lack of public transport service in Send. Send is served only by hourly busses to Guildford, and the Villages Medical Centre has no bus service at all to it. There is extremely limited parking at the Send village shops, and the shops that are in the village are very limited (a handful of newsagents/convenience stores, a café, a charity shop, two takeaway restaurants, and some miscellaneous businesses - not enough to sustain someone who does not drive). Consequently, anyone living in these proposed new developments and needing to access these businesses, the Villages Medical Centre, or the local primary school will likely need to drive to them. This seems to be an extremely ill-thought-through policy in terms of environmental sensitivity, and I suspect it is not one that GBC has actually considered at all as part of the Local Plan. I would be interested to hear your thoughts on whether this has been considered by members. I also have major concerns about traffic congestion in the village, which is already an issue, and the safety of Tannery Lane. I have already personally witnessed a serious car accident in the last few months on Polesden Lane/Tannery Lane junction, due to it being 2.75m wide. When this becomes a hub for major traffic, including commercial vehicles of considerable size, accidents will inevitably increase as it is not possible to increase the size of the Polesden Road junction. The same issue applies at Send Hill in relation to Policy A44. I am sure that GBC have considered this as part of the Local Plan and are prepared for the increase in traffic accidents in already dangerous areas; perhaps you could tell me the exact nature of the discussions by Council members when they debated this? 11

Continuing my analysis of Policies A42 and A44, I charge that it would be wise of the Council to use up-to-date government guidance when determining aspects of the Local Plan. It is clear from the Local Plan that you have used a June 2012 Traveller Accommodation Assessment policy as evidence for the June 2016 Proposed Submission Local Plan and the 2016 Land Availability Assessment. As the government published a new policy for traveller sites in August 2015, the Borough's June 2012 assessment must therefore be considered out-of-date. Curiously, you have referenced this yourself on p.94 of your own Sustainability Appraisal, acknowledging the out-of-date nature of the policy. I am staggered that GBC considers it acceptable to use superseded policy as grounds for decision making; you will, therefore, accept that any decisions taken using the 2012 Traveller Accommodation Assessment policy in the Local Plan are not valid due to the policy being used beyond its lifespan. Consequently, I restate my objections to policies A42 and A44; they should be removed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it."

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6552  **Respondent:** 15595297 / Caroline Davison  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill. This land is totally unsuitable for building on, being an old landfill site and a single track road. Build in the towns please!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6592  **Respondent:** 15596129 / Kim Beauchamp  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers' pitches at Send Hill. Another ridiculous idea. As with the Clockbarn proposal, the affect of the additional traffic on the already congested Send Road will be significant and unacceptable. Send Hill is also a narrow residential lane and will be badly affected by the additional traffic. I do not accept the proposal that there are to be two travellers' pitches in Send. [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it] and following the recent closure of Ripley police station and the loss of our local police presence (policemen on the beat) there will be no deterrent at all in our village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6605  **Respondent:** 15596513 / Christine Matthews  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY A44

On Policy A44. 1.9a Land West of Winds Ridge and Send Hill 1. I object to the proposal on the grounds that Send Hill is in part a single track entry road and too narrow, particularly at the Potters Lane Junction, to accommodate the extra traffic the proposed development would bring.

1. I object to the proposal on the ground that Send is in Green Belt. The proposed inset is inappropriate due to its permanent green belt status.
2. I object to the proposal on the grounds that the existing roads and parking infrastructure is already inadequate and could not cope with the extra traffic.

3. I object to the proposal on the grounds that the proposed development site (A44) was used as a GBC registered landfill site. Disturbance of the site would be a health hazard due to the unknown materials in the site.

5 I object to the inclusion of Traveller Accommodation on Send Hill due to the disturbance of an existing community. If significant development is in prospect the Traveller Accommodation should be planned as an integral part of such new development (as for affordable housing) rather than imposed on the existing community.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6625  Respondent: 15596961 / Peter Meadows  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We strongly object to the proposed development of 40 houses and two pitches for travellers. The single width road is inadequate and such a development would be a visual blight on the much treasured countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7252  Respondent: 15602529 / Darren Lambert  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7269  Respondent: 15603361 / Ann Watkins  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill – this is an unsuitable location due to the narrow single access country road. The subsoil of the land is documented as unsafe landfill.

- Amount of new housing proposed far exceeds local need.
- Housing density excessive when compared with existing development.
- Would transform Ripley and Send into a sizable town, something for which no case is made.
- No local support.
- Collective impact of these 4 sites on a small part of the borough not considered. Should not be treated as isolated, separate sites.
- Total amount of new building out of scale with the planned...
development elsewhere the borough, especially less sensitive urban areas not protected by Green Belt. • Sites unsustainable. Key infrastructure lacking. No adequate provision is made to increase it – e.g. poor wastewater capacity, lack of schools, absence of traffic management plan, flooding. • No account taken of additional impact of Wisley Airfield site on surrounding villages. • Extension of settlement boundaries too permissive.

• Green Belt gap with neighbouring settlements hugely narrowed, especially if Wisley Airfield is built on. • Will harm compliance with NPPF 81 – e.g. by making cycling (including Prudential cycle races) too dangerous, ruining the rural setting of Waterloo Farm campsite, destroying the ambience of Grange Park Opera’s new “Theatre in the Woods”. • Policy A40 especially unviable because of high water table and poor drainage, leading to regular winter flooding. • Safe access and egress at Site A40 unachievable, owing to flooding, high speed limits, poor sight lines, narrow access to existing properties, inadequate pavements for elderly and schoolchildren, increasing use by recreational cyclists etc.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6871</th>
<th>Respondent: 15609057 / Julian Long</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to Policy A44 - 1.9ha land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill designated for 40 homes and 2 Travellers pitches. This site is new and was not included in the regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted on previously. Development for housing is inappropriate due to its permanent Green Belt status and high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt by any development. The subsoil of the existinf site contains documented unsafe landfill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers pitches is inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7651</th>
<th>Respondent: 15609185 / Sophocles Alexiou</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 travellers’ pitches at Send Hill. Another ridiculous idea. As with the Clockbarn proposal, the affect of the additional traffic on the already congested Send Road will be significant and unacceptable. Send Hill is also a narrow residential lane and will be badly affected by the additional traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6988</th>
<th>Respondent: 15614721 / Charles Leonard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another very serious matter that needs to be addressed is the fact that some of the proposed new sites are on land designated in the past as land which has been used as landfill and "refuse and slag-heap" land. This information has been collected from Ordanance Survey maps from the years 1963 to 1968. Surely to excavate these sites would, without doubt, bring severe health issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6989</th>
<th>Respondent: 15614753 / Anthony McCulloch</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another very serious matter that needs to be addressed is the fact that some of the proposed new sites are on land designated in the past as land which has been used as landfill and "refuse and slag-heap" land. This information has been collected from Ordanance Survey maps from the years 1963 to 1968. Surely to excavate these sites would, without doubt, bring severe health issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6990</th>
<th>Respondent: 15614785 / Richard Palmer</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another very serious matter that needs to be addressed is the fact that some of the proposed new sites are on land designated in the past as land which has been used as landfill and "refuse and slag-heap" land. This information has been collected from Ordanance Survey maps from the years 1963 to 1968. Surely to excavate these sites would, without doubt, bring severe health issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6991</th>
<th>Respondent: 15614817 / Jan Pearson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another very serious matter that needs to be addressed is the fact that some of the proposed new sites are on land designated in the past as land which has been used as landfill and "refuse and slag-heap" land. This information has been collected from Ordanance Survey maps from the years 1963 to 1968. Surely to excavate these sites would, without doubt, bring severe health issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Another very serious matter that needs to be addressed is the fact that some of the proposed new sites are on land designated in the past as land which has been used as landfill and "refuse and slag-heap" land. This information has been collected from Ordnance Survey maps from the years 1963 to 1968. Surely to excavate these sites would, without doubt, bring severe health issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7624  Respondent: 15615297 / Carole Butcher  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Another very serious matter that needs to be addressed is the fact that some of the proposed new sites are on land designated in the past as land which has been used as landfill and "refuse and slag-heap" land. This information has been collected from Ordnance Survey maps from the years 1963 to 1968. Surely to excavate these sites would, without doubt, bring severe health issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7136  Respondent: 15629025 / Surrey County Council (Sir or madam)  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A44

Land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill, Send Page 225

Under the column headed “Requirements,” please include the following bullet point: “The junction of Send Hill with Potters Lane needs improving to provide improved visibility.”

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7209  Respondent: 15633217 / Emma Cooper  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of 2 travellers pitches at Send Hill, I can not understand why this would benefit our village in the slightest and why any borough would actively encourage these pitches.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7236  Respondent: 15634145 / Annette Davies  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the development of the Travellers pitches at Send Hill as this area is not very accessible being a single tack country road in part.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7239  Respondent: 15634177 / John Davies  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of the Travellers pitches at Send Hill as this area is not very accessible being a single tack country road in part.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7262  Respondent: 15637633 / Scott Kent  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The proposal is not in keeping and sympathetic to the area as stated. The proposed is an over development squeezing far too many new small homes in a very limited space. 40 new homes would mean a prospected 80 number cars. Where would 80 cars park? This additional traffic would have a vast negative impact to the Send Hill road and again not be “sympathetic to the surrounding area”. This land is currently used by local residents for recreational walking and nature observing. Wood peckers, Owl’s Bats and badgers are all regularly seen here along with many other forms of wild life such as the protected May bug. The loss of their habitation could never be sympathetically catered for and would clearly be detrimental to their survival. The land is currently used as common land and should remain so as this is actually the only green open space for the local residents to use. The addition of two traveller’s pitches would [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it] and again I do not see how anyone can argue that this is in keeping with the local area and its residents. Send villages road network and infrastructure is already at a capacity that exceeds that of the size of the village current road network as Send and its back road are used on mass as a trunk road through into Woking and beyond. We understand that that there are already plans to builder a number of homes at he bottom of Send Hill within the existing School grounds of St Bede’s. So the proposed is an over development of this immediate area.

I wish it to be noted that this is yet another attempt to over develop this area. Would you please advise when will the council stop threatening the residents of Send Hill?

I wish it to be noted that the Council has subjected this community to far too much repeated duress due to theses numerous and repeated threats / attempts to ruin the local area and its green belt country side. This has many detrimental impacts to those subjected to this process such as added stress, mental health certainly to the vulnerable and elderly. The council have a moral duty here to the residents of Send Hill of which it is clearly treating unfairly.

I am sure no one would object to sensible planning or development of which this is clearly not.

I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7353  Respondent: 15641569 / Trevalyn Gregory  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7609  Respondent: 15657057 / Frances Turner  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY A44 SEND HILL

I object to policy A44 Send Hill

There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

The proposed development is not sustainable because of poor infrastructure. Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site for travellers or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring. The site is a high quality green belt amenity area within beautiful surrounding countryside and would be spoilt by the development.

A Wasteland Solutions environmental report on Send Hill dated March 2004 gave evidence of past ponding of water in the excavated area. Further development would disturb the water table and increase risk of flooding to surrounding properties.

The site was used as a GBC registered landfill site and shown on the 1963-8 Ordnance Survey maps as “refuse and slag heap”. It is therefore unsuitable for such a development on health reasons.

On the 1971 Ordnance Survey the site is shown as a “refuse tip” prior to when proper licensing/registration was required. The date of the landfill works predates the 1999 EU Landfill Directive regulations. I therefore believe that there is a danger that any disturbance would be health hazard due to the unknown materials.

GBC has installed gas monitoring wells on site since July 2000. One well recording methane gas discharge and development of this site would be a health hazard.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/7647  Respondent: 15658497 / Philip Willians  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to policy A44 which would see 40 homes and two travellers' pitches on land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill. This was again a NEW site NOT included in 18 draft and therefore has NOT been consulted on previously. Once again this is Green Belt land partly containing unsafe landfill. Access is by a narrow lane which could never take the volume of traffic that would ensue from traveller's pitches. It is an inappropriate location because the narrow width single access country road provides insufficient access. The subsoil of the proposed site contains documented unsafe landfill waste registered at GBC. Any development there would spoil a high amenity area set in beautiful countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7718  Respondent: 15665697 / Elizabeth Cross  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to policy A44 which would see 40 homes and two travellers' pitches on land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill. This was again a NEW site NOT included in 18 draft and therefore has NOT been consulted on previously. Once again this is Green Belt land partly containing unsafe landfill. Access is by a narrow lane which could never take the volume of traffic that would ensue from traveller's pitches. It is an inappropriate location because the narrow width single access country road provides insufficient access. The subsoil of the proposed site contains documented unsafe landfill waste registered at GBC. Any development there would spoil a high amenity area set in beautiful countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7738  Respondent: 15667489 / Tibbalds (Jon Herbert)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This site is allocated for 40 homes and 2 traveller pitches. The Parish is concerned about the proposed access arrangements since Send Hill is a very narrow road; two cars have difficulty passing one another in places. An additional 40 homes would significantly increase the chances of two cars meeting, resulting in congestion and access issues with little scope to widen the road. This site is over 1km from the shops and the nearest bus stops in the centre of Send. Send Hill does not have any pavements for the majority of its length and would be difficult to walk along, especially for those with push chairs or mobility problems. The Parish Council are also concerned about the impact that increased traffic on Send Hill will have on the adjacent multi-denominational cemetery. This site is used by local people as a quiet place for contemplation. Resident’s enjoyment will be diminished by an increase in passing traffic, especially during construction.

Send Parish Council question whether the proposed allocation for two traveller pitches is appropriate in light of the Council’s evidence base. The most recent Traveller Accommodation Assessment is from June 2012. This identifies the number of pitches that are needed within the borough and is listed under the evidence base for the June 2016 Proposed Submission Local Plan. The 2012 assessment appears to have been used as a basis for current draft policies and the 2016 Land Availability Assessment.
The government’s most recent policy for traveller sites was published in August 2015 and sets out the best approaches for planning for traveller sites. Since the Borough’s current Traveller Accommodation Assessment was published significantly before the 2015 guidance, it should be considered out of date. The dated nature of the 2012 assessment is recognised in the June 2016 Sustainability Appraisal, which states on page 94 that the Council have decided to over-allocate traveller sites in light of the dated evidence base.

The Parish Council consider this approach to be unsound and therefore request that the evidence base for the total number of traveller pitches required is re-visited to ensure that it is up to date.

Neighbourhood Plans

The Local Plan should provide the opportunity for sites in inset villages to be allocated through the neighbourhood plan process, allowing local communities to identify and allocate the most appropriate sites for development in accordance with neighbourhood planning principles and general conformity with strategic policy.

Proposed Changes to Make the Local Plan Sound

Remove allocations A43 Garlick’s Arch and A43a Slip roads.

Reinstate allocation A43 Land around Burnt Common Warehouse, as set out in drafts of the Proposed Submission Local Plan reviewed by the Borough, Economy and Infrastructure Executive Advisory Board on 13 April 2016.

Remove allocations A42 and A44 in order to allow the Parish Council the opportunity to allocate suitable alternative sites through the Local Plan process.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7881  Respondent: 15667489 / Tibbalds (Jon Herbert)  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This site is allocated for 40 homes and 2 traveller pitches. The Parish is concerned about the proposed access arrangements since Send Hill is a very narrow road; two cars have difficulty passing one another in places. An additional 40 homes would significantly increase the chances of two cars meeting, resulting in congestion and access issues with little scope to widen the road. This site is over 1km from the shops and the nearest bus stops in the centre of Send. Send Hill does not have any pavements for the majority of its length and would be difficult to walk along, especially for those with push chairs or mobility problems. The Parish Council are also concerned about the impact that increased traffic on Send Hill will have on the adjacent multi-denominational cemetery. This site is used by local people as a quiet place for contemplation. Resident’s enjoyment will be diminished by an increase in passing traffic, especially during construction.

Send Parish Council question whether the proposed allocation for two traveller pitches is appropriate in light of the Council’s evidence base. The most recent Traveller Accommodation Assessment is from June 2012. This identifies the number of pitches that are needed within the borough and is listed under the evidence base for the June 2016 Proposed Submission Local Plan. The 2012 assessment appears to have been used as a basis for current draft policies and the 2016 Land Availability Assessment.

The government’s most recent policy for traveller sites was published in August 2015 and sets out the best approaches for planning for traveller sites. Since the Borough’s current Traveller Accommodation Assessment was published significantly before the 2015 guidance, it should be considered out of date. The dated nature of the 2012 assessment is recognised in the June 2016 Sustainability Appraisal, which states on page 94 that the Council have decided to over-allocate traveller sites in light of the dated evidence base.

The Parish Council consider this approach to be unsound and therefore request that the evidence base for the total number of traveller pitches required is re-visited to ensure that it is up to date.

Neighbourhood Plans
The Local Plan should provide the opportunity for sites in inset villages to be allocated through the neighbourhood plan process, allowing local communities to identify and allocate the most appropriate sites for development in accordance with neighbourhood planning principles and general conformity with strategic policy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8143  Respondent: 15671297 / JB Planning Associates (Sue Foster)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? (Yes), is Sound? (No), is Legally Compliant? (Yes)

Our representations with respect to Policy A44 are set out in Section 4 of our submission.

Representation on Policy A44: Land to the West of Winds Ridge and Send Hill, Send

Introduction

1. This representation is submitted on behalf of Countryside Properties in response to the Council’s decision to allocate Land to the West of Winds Ridge and Send Hill as a Strategic Site Allocation (Policy A44) in the Regulation 19 Proposed Submission Local Plan.

1. This site, of approximately 9 ha, comprises three fields currently used for informal recreation. The fields are enclosed by substantial hedgerows and treecover to the north, south and west, with residential gardens to the east of the site.

1. Below we briefly set out why we consider the proposed allocation is less sustainable than our Client’s site on land to the south of New Pond Road,

1. With regard to the landscape and visual impact of the proposed allocation and Green Belt considerations, we refer below to the key findings of the ‘Site Comparison Study’ prepared on behalf of our Client by Barton Willmore. The full findings of the Study are set out in Appendix 4.5.

1. In terms of sustainability we draw upon the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Guildford Proposed Submission Local Plan, which we have, where necessary, amended to address inaccuracies that we have noted with respect to our Client’s. These results are set out in a table (see Appendix 4.6).

Landscape and Visual Impact

1. Barton Willmore has produced a Site Comparison Study, which provides a comparative assessment of our Client’s site against 4 other sites that have been identified as housing allocations within the Proposed Submission Local Plan. These were selected on the basis that they are also located outside of the settlement boundaries, within the Green Belt and are non-strategic. The sites are:

Policy A38: Land to the West of West Horsley

Policy A41: Land to the South of West Horsley

Policy A44: Land to the West of Winds Ridge and Send Hill, Send

Policy A47: Land to the East of The Paddocks, Flexford

1. Below we identify some of its key findings with respect to the impact of the development of Site A44 on landscape character:
• Substantial loss of vegetation which would comprise hedgerows, long grassland and mature trees, particularly along its boundary with Send Hill;
• Further urbanisation to Send Hill and also the perception of encroachment of the settlement pattern in a westerly direction;
• Potential substantial visual effects to views from the adjoining PRoWs; and
• Substantial loss of tranquility

1. With respect to the contribution that Site A44 makes to the function of the Green Belt, Barton Willmore identified that:

• Development would result in the erosion of the semi-rural lane character of Send Hill in this location, with residential development on both sides and therefore would result in some
• The site represents a transition between the settlement and the wider landscape to the west, and forms a coherent buffer to the settlement pattern in this Furthermore, there is no robust defensible boundary to the west of the site (with the exception of the boundary tree belt) and therefore the land to the west of the site would be subject to further development pressure.

1. Barton Willmore’s study concludes that our Client’s site is comparative with the other sites in relation to landscape and visual considerations, in that it does not score significantly differently from the others to warrant its exclusion from the Proposed Submission Local Plan. In fact, our Client’s site scores considerably better in some respects to the other sites with regard to landscape and visual considerations, for example, our Client’s site is of lesser tranquillity due to the fact that it is adjoined by New Pond Road, and does not contain any footpaths, listed buildings or notable landscape features within the site

Sustainability

1. JBPA has produced a Site Comparison Table (Appendix6) which looks at the same 4 sites identified in the Barton Willmore Assessment in terms of their overall sustainability as proposed housing allocations. It also compares these sites with our Client’s land at New Pond Road, Farncombe, and with land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford (Site A46) which has been brought forward as a new proposed housing allocation at the Proposed Submission Draft stage of the Local Plan. A separate representation on Site A46 is included with our submission in section 5.

1. When considering sustainability, we have drawn initially upon the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Guildford Proposed Submission Local We have, however, where necessary amended the scorings to address inaccuracies that we have noted in the SA with respect to our Client’s site. This includes correcting the distance to the nearest Primary School as the SA suggests this is less than 2km, when in fact it is less than 1km. We have also identified from available MAFF records that our Client’s land contains Grade 3 agricultural land, as opposed to Grade 1 land which is identified in the SA.

1. Below we set out our key conclusions when comparing Site A44 with our Client’s site:

1. Site A44 scored poorly (red) in relation to 7 sustainability criteria, whereas our Client’s site only scored poorly in 3 criteria
2. Site A44 is further from a key employment site, recreation facilities, a primary school, a secondary school and a railway station than our Client’s site
3. Site A44 is closer to a European Site (SPA and SAC) than our Client’s site
4. The development of Site A44 would result in the loss of higher quality agricultural land than our Client’s site
5. Our Client’s site scored worse than A44 with respect to flood risk, and its location within the AONB, however we have demonstrated in our site specific representation in relation to our Client’s site (Section 3) that it makes limited to no contribution to the special qualities and features of the Surrey Hills AONB, and that the area of the site within a flood zone has been agreed with the Environment Agency and will be left undeveloped

1. Beyond the sustainability criteria considered above, it is also worth noting that the site is a former quarry and there is also therefore the potential for poor ground conditions which may affect the deliverability and viability of developing the site

Conclusion

1. Informed by the findings of Barton Willmore’s “Site Comparison Study” and the Sustainability Appraisal of the Guildford Proposed Submission Local Plan, this representation sets out why we consider the proposed allocation
at Land to the West of Winds Ridge and Send Hill (Site A44) is less sustainable and suitable than our Client’s site on land to the south of New Pond Road.

1. Barton Willmore’s study identifies that the site makes a contribution to two Green Belt purposes, including a substantial contribution with respect to checking the unrestricted sprawl of built up The development of the site would result in the substantial loss of vegetation along its boundary with Send Hill, further urbanisation to Send Hill and the perception of encroachment of the settlement pattern in a westerly direction. It would also have potential substantial visual effects to views from the adjoining PRoWs; and result in a substantial loss of tranquillity.

1. With respect to Sustainability we have determined that the site scored poorly (red) over significantly more sustainability criteria than our Client’s Thus, our Client’s site represents a more sustainable location than a comparable site identified in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

Tests of Soundness

1. We consider that there is a risk of the Local Plan being found unsound with the proposed allocation of Site A44, instead of our Client’s site on land to the south of New Pond Road, because it will not be ‘justified’, as it does not represent the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives.

Proposed Modifications

1. In view of the above considerations, we believe that Land to the West of Winds Ridge and Send Hill (Site A44) should be removed from the Local Plan prior to submission for Examination.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  Policy A44.docx (54 KB)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8144  Respondent: 15671297 / JB Planning Associates (Sue Foster)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Please see our representations with respect to specific sections of the plan on the Question 6 Comments Form.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  Policy A44.pdf (442 KB)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7830  Respondent: 15674273 / Savills for Thames Water (Katherine Jones)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7925  Respondent: 15687329 / Kim Sweeting  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44
I would like to object to the inclusion of this site in the draft local plan for the following reasons:

1. The number of houses needed in the Borough was changed between the first and second issues of the draft plan indicating that there is considerable uncertainty in this figure and the basis and method of calculation. In view of the recent EU referendum vote and its impact on future immigration, the number of houses required is likely to reduce further. With smaller house numbers the need for any loss of the Greenbelt should be reassessed as 'special circumstances' necessary for reclassification have not been established.
2. This site was introduced at the last minute and there has been insufficient time for consultation before its inclusion in the draft plan.
3. This development will add to the disproportionate burden on the north east of the Borough.
4. There is a question as to the suitability of the land for building purposes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to removal of Brownfield site (A34) from the Plan
Site A44 in Broadford Business Park has also been removed. This is another brownfield site that has already been developed. The Council's claims to "have adopted a 'brownfield first' approach" (page 5) but this is clearly not the case, and is contrary to national guidelines.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to removal of Brownfield site (A34) from the Plan
Site A44 in Broadford Business Park has also been removed. This is another brownfield site that has already been developed. The Council’s claims to “have adopted a ‘brownfield first’ approach” (page 5) but this is clearly not the case, and is contrary to national guidelines.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object categorically to Policy A44 (Winds Ridge/Send Hill, Send) because

The local infrastructure cannot support an increase of residents and associated traffic at that level; Send Hill in parts is a country, single lane road with poor access to surrounding areas and could not facilitate the proposed increase in levels of traffic thereby creating access issues;

The local school(s) are not able to accommodate an increase in pupils at this level and are struggling to meet current demand;

It ignores hundreds of previous objections made;

There is no proven demand for traveller pitches in this location and the introduction of such pitches will have an impact on local house values;

It is rural, agricultural land and not meant for this type of development and this only works to erode the Green Belt and the glorious views of local our precious countryside;

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3183  Respondent: 17399681 / Anthony Smith  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There is virtually no infrastructure planning for sites A42, A43 and A44, which between them will have a serious impact on all local infrastructure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3394  Respondent: 17424705 / Keith Brothwell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of 40 houses and 2 traveller pitches at Send Hill. It is an inappropriate location because of the narrow width single access country road providing insufficient access - please see below for further details on traffic issues. The subsoil of the proposed site contains documented unsafe landfill waste registered at GBC. Any development there would spoil beautiful and historic countryside including the ‘five manors of Send’ which are a matter of historic record.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4851  Respondent: 17484449 / Thames Water Utilities Ltd (Sir or Madam)  Agent: Savills (Richard Hill)

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A44

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Water Response</th>
<th>Waste Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51759</td>
<td>A44 - Land West of Winds Ridge and Send Hill, Send</td>
<td>This site falls outside of Thames Water’s water supply boundary.</td>
<td>On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Total records: 565.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A45 - Land at the rear of the Talbot, High Street, Ripley
**Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2703</th>
<th>Respondent: 8565185 / Mr Dave Robins</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT TO site A45 The Talbot. This is overdevelopment in a conservation area. Overdevelopment in Ripley will completely spoil the feel of a village which will then be lost forever.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2961</th>
<th>Respondent: 8590753 / Mr Michael Anning</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7028</th>
<th>Respondent: 8601601 / Mr Roy Dyer</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We object to the proposals at the rear of the Talbot as the development would be on Green Belt land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7285</th>
<th>Respondent: 8732353 / Simon Marshall</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to site A45 the Talbot another overdevelopment in a conservation area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment ID: PSLPS16/5982  Respondent: 8812833 / Simon P Hill  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site A45 The Talbot. This is over development in a conservation area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4551  Respondent: 8813505 / Peter Grimble  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4927  Respondent: 8817121 / Celia Howard  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3458  Respondent: 8840161 / Richard Ayears  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the inclusion of Policy A45 because of the loss of commercial space in the heart of the village and the loss of Green Belt to the rear of The Talbot. I could accept with reluctance an amendment to the if the site only used the previously developed land and no development took place on the greenfield part of the site. The harm to the Green Belt would be reduced if only previously developed element was to be put forward.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7180</th>
<th>Respondent: 8840161 / Richard Ayears</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the inclusion of Policy A45 because of the loss of commercial space in the heart of the village and the loss of Green Belt to the rear of The Talbot. I could accept with reluctance an amendment to the if the site only used the previously developed land and no development took place on the greenfield part of the site. The harm to the Green Belt would be reduced if only previously developed element was to be put forward.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1004</th>
<th>Respondent: 8848033 / Paul Gerrard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object. I believe it is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, and therefore any development is subject to EU/UK legislation (NPPF 119). The impact cannot be mitigated with SANGs because there is no evidence base to support SANGs as required by NRM6 viii, NPPF 158 and 166.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4954</th>
<th>Respondent: 8862465 / Nik Church</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2138</th>
<th>Respondent: 8897377 / Jan Jewers</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I object to site A45 The Talbot, this is over development in a conservation area and Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment ID: PSLPS16/7322  Respondent: 8900641 / Caroline Carr  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site A45 The Talbot – I consider this to be over development in a conservation area

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6135  Respondent: 8923969 / Stephen Newt  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site A45 Land behind Talbot Hotel. This site would result in an extension of the line of settlement on top of an extension of the line of settlement in a conservation area. One old cottage would become totally surrounded by new housing from 3 different developments in the last 5 years. This would result in over 70 houses in abutting developments in the last 5 years of the same design period in a conservation area. This will fundamentally alter the conservation area and overwhelm it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/288  Respondent: 8926657 / Lian Grieves  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

7) I OBJECT to the development at the Talbot (site A45) which is not appropriate in a conservation area as it is overdevelopment.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/279  Respondent: 8929921 / Caspar Hancock  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

7) I OBJECT to the development at the Talbot (site A45) which represents overdevelopment in a conservation area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6333</th>
<th>Respondent: 10430401 / St John the Evangelist (Mark Woodward)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT TO site A45 The Talbot – This is overdevelopment in a conservation area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7548</th>
<th>Respondent: 10723553 / Judith Pound</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT TO site A45 The Talbot – this is overdevelopment in a conservation area, blatantly ignoring the values of an important conservation area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2231</th>
<th>Respondent: 10725537 / D. Warriner</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the site on the A45 behind the Talbat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5471</th>
<th>Respondent: 10731329 / Sheila Hookins</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6201</th>
<th>Respondent: 10820417 / Trevor Smith</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6210  Respondent: 10820481 / Lisa Smith  Agent:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong>  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to site A45 The Talbot – this is overdevelopment in a conversation area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4873  Respondent: 10844609 / Sam Critchlow  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong>  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/199  Respondent: 10849377 / Vickie Leonard  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong>  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the A45 The Talbot as this is overdevelopment in a conservation area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/569  Respondent: 10866305 / Christine Reeves  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong>  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to site A45 The Talbot - this is overdevelopment in a conservation area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1357</th>
<th>Respondent: 10898721 / J Hawkins</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</td>
<td>is Sound? ( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to site A45 The Talbot. I believe this is overdevelopment in a conservation area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5474</th>
<th>Respondent: 10899233 / Frederick Hookins</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</td>
<td>is Sound? ( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to site A45 The Talbot as causing overdevelopment in a conservation area, again, the local roads are narrow and unsuitable for heavy traffic. It can be difficult coping at present and building on this site would only exacerbate the problem.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7274</th>
<th>Respondent: 10900065 / Jenny and Guy Marshall</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</td>
<td>is Sound? ( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to site A45 the Talbot another overdevelopment in a conservation area. I object to site A25 Goaden hill farm another massive overdevelopment in the Green Belt as is site A35 Wisley airfield inappropriate and unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7281  Respondent: 10900065 / Jenny and Guy Marshall  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site A45 the Talbot another overdevelopment in a conservation area. I object to site A25 Goaden hill farm another massive overdevelopment in the Green Belt as is site A35 Wisley airfield inappropriate and unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4804  Respondent: 10910369 / Karen Doyle  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4790  Respondent: 10920001 / Jeff Doyle  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3651  Respondent: 10924769 / Christy Dadswell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7408  Respondent: 10945057 / Margaret Field  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6486  Respondent: 10960353 / Trish White  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site A45 The Talbot as this is overdevelopment in a conservation area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2712  Respondent: 11000385 / Sheila Robins  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO site A45 The Talbot. This is overdevelopment in a conservation area. Overdevelopment in Ripley will completely spoil the feel of a village which will then be lost forever.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/452  Respondent: 11036321 / Vinciane Ollington  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I Object to the site A45 The Talbot

This is an unreasonable overdevelopment in a conservation area. Ripley has already been impacted by at least 7 new housing developments in the past 3 years, without any improvements in roads, bus services, schools and medical centres.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I Object to Policy A45.
It could never satisfy Policy S1.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2959  Respondent: 11098241 / Sammy Chalk  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7306  Respondent: 11182849 / Ian Featherstone  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to this development on green belt land, Ripley has absorbed many new dwellings over the last few years, this is now starting to create severe parking problems for residents and visitors reducing the attraction of the village and potentially damaging the existing businesses.

I will be happy to provide any further details about my objections to the Draft Plan and hope that consideration will be given to the points raised.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3304  Respondent: 15063745 / John Pryce  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of the A45 Talbot site, as this is in a conservation area, which obviously means it must be 'conserved' as it is.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/272  Respondent: 15068257 / Thomas Tuck  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

5) I object to site A45 The Talbot

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4273  Respondent: 15115201 / Katherine Mutton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the proposed development at Wisley. This will cause huge traffic problems on the A3 and M.25 in both directions. It is also located opposite the world famous Wisley Gardens which already brings a large amount of traffic to the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/157  Respondent: 15127649 / Neil Blaydon  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT TO site A45 The Talbot. This is overdevelopment in a conservation area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/182  Respondent: 15136481 / Roy Padgett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to The Talbot (site A45) which is an overdevelopment in a conservation area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/196  Respondent: 15137409 / Mark Costello  Agent:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/206</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15138049 / Mark Leonard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to site A45 The Talbot. This is overdevelopment in a Conservation area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/4452</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15140417 / Jeff Greenwood</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the site A45 The Talbot - This is over development in a conservation area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/4464</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15140641 / Sandra Greenwood</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the site A45 The Talbot - This is over developement in a conservation area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/230</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15141953 / R Pumphrey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to site A45 The Talbot, this is overdevelopment in a conservation area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/241  Respondent: 15143297 / Ronald Mounsey  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to site A45 The Talbot. This is over development in a conservation area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/245  Respondent: 15143393 / Susan Mounsey  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to site A45 The Talbot. This is over development in a conservation area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1599  Respondent: 15150817 / Robert Winborn  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

4) I OBJECT TO Site A45 the Talbot. This is a conservation area and will cause over development in an area that does not need it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/457  Respondent: 15189025 / Matthew Cliff  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to site A45, The Talbot hotel, this is over-development in a conservation area, which will lead to even more traffic in the village of Ripley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/469  Respondent: 15192257 / Jennifer Cliff  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site A45, The Talbot hotel, this is over-development in a conservation area, which should be cherished and prized by the borough, and not wantonly destroyed; The High Street is already regularly at a standstill because of too much traffic, and can take no more vehicle movements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/589  Respondent: 15208353 / Janet Green  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

4) I OBJECT TO site A45 The Talbot- this is over development in a conservation area

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/596  Respondent: 15208417 / Colin Green  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

4) I OBJECT TO site A45 The Talbot- this is over development in a conservation area

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/601  Respondent: 15208513 / Lauren Green  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/607</th>
<th>Respondent: 15208545 / Charlotte Green</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td>4) I OBJECT TO site A45 The Talbot- this is over development in a conservation area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/639</th>
<th>Respondent: 15216321 / Douglas Ollington</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td>4) I OBJECT TO site A45 The Talbot- this is over development in a conservation area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5154</th>
<th>Respondent: 15238049 / Glenda Charlick</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td>1. I Object to the site A45 The Talbot This is an unreasonable overdevelopment in a conservation area. Ripley has already been impacted by at least 7 new housing developments in the past 3 years, without any improvements in roads, bus services, schools are medical centres.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/860</th>
<th>Respondent: 15245697 / Justine Butler</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td>I object to site A45 The Talbot - this is overdevelopment in a conservation area.Wisley Airfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT TO SITE A45 THE TALBOT - this is overdevelopment in a conservation area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1085  Respondent: 15265793 / Sam Rowley  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

4  I OBJECT TO SITE A45 THE TALBOT

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7973  Respondent: 15278369 / Ripley Parish Council (Jim Morris)  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

99. This site is allocated for 18 Homes (C3) and 200 m of retail or service uses (A1-A5).
100. The site is within the Ripley Conservation Area, adjoins listed buildings including the Grade 2* Talbot Inn which falls within the top 6% of listed buildings.

101. There does not appear to have been any assessment of the impact of the proposed development on the significance of designated heritage assets, including the effect on the setting of the listed buildings adjoining the effect on the character and appearance of the conservation area and its setting. The duties under section 66 and 72 of the Listed Buildings Act 1990 need to be considered at this stage as the plan making process is part of the planning functions which engage such duties.

102. The proposals also involve redrawing the Green Belt boundary to exclude the site and to include it within the Ripley village inset area.

103. There is nothing to suggest that the decision to allocated the land and exclude it from the GB was based on any assessment of its Green Belt functions. The rear of the site is still entirely open, being down to paddock and it plainly still serves most of the GB purposes, including the protection of historic settlements villages. The type of development which would occur with access from part of the core of the historic centre of the village would be to create modern cul-de sac development which is wholly inconsistent with the historic character of the location. The frontage of the site (currently a car sales yards and showroom) and possibly part of the area to the rear which is previously developed land could be redeveloped for a much smaller housing scheme, but without the need to take the open greenfield land to the south.

104. The loss of the small industrial units to the rear should be reconsidered. Such facilities are increasingly rare and valuable within rural settlements and are often lost to more lucrative housing development.
105. There are no exceptional circumstances for to justify the redrawing of the Green Belt as proposed and the
development would be inconsistent with the NPPF.

Conclusions

106. RPC objects to the allocation as currently proposed and recommends that the PSLP should be modified to exclude
from allocation the open land to the south and east of the site that are included in the allocation and the Green Belt status
of the land should be retained.

107. RPC further recommends that the light industrial uses in the Barn buildings to the rear of the site should be
recognised in the plan and to be protected from redevelopment, not least by removal from the allocation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1284  Respondent: 15284801 / Linda Jarvis  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

I object to site A45 The Talbot. This is over development in a conversation area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1307  Respondent: 15292129 / Shirley Wilson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

I object to A45 the land at the rear of the Talbot, High street, Ripley this would expand the boundaries of the village and
the main road car parks could not cope with any more traffic it’s bad enough at the moment in rush and you cannot park
to pop to the post office or to use the local amenities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1664  Respondent: 15292129 / Shirley Wilson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )
I object to A45 the land at the rear of the Talbot, High street, Ripley this would expand the boundaries of the village and the main road car parks could not cope with any more traffic it’s bad enough at the moment in rush and you cannot park to pop to the post office or to use the local amenities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1329  Respondent: 15297217 / Elizabeth White  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site A45 The Talbot - over development in a conservation area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1589  Respondent: 15299041 / Elizabeth Teece  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to site A45 The Talbot - This is overdevelopment in a conservation area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1779  Respondent: 15348481 / Donna Styles  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

4. I OBJECT TO – The Talbot Site A45. Overdevelopment in a conservation area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1857  Respondent: 15351873 / Magaret Winborn  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT TO site A45 the Talbot. This is a conservation area and will cause over development in an area that does not need it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1934</th>
<th>Respondent: 15356385 / Mervyn Plumtree</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to site A45 The Talbot- this is over development in a conservation area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2341</th>
<th>Respondent: 15385985 / Sally Almeida</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) I Object To site A45 The Talbot-This is overdevelopment in a conservation area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2528</th>
<th>Respondent: 15400961 / Joan Plumtree</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to site A45 The Talbot- this is over development in a conservation area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7590</th>
<th>Respondent: 15422625 / Graham Burrows</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document page number 602
I object to The Talbot, which is an over development in a conservation area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2816</th>
<th>Respondent: 15426369 / Harvey West</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2843</th>
<th>Respondent: 15426657 / Jean Birkby</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2842</th>
<th>Respondent: 15426721 / S Mayersbeth</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2957</th>
<th>Respondent: 15430369 / Sarah Long</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/3647  Respondent: 15454497 / Rick Parker  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3648  Respondent: 15454529 / Janet Tarbet  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3649  Respondent: 15454561 / Charles Dadswell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3650  Respondent: 15454593 / Jack Dadswell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3653</th>
<th>Respondent: 15454657 / Tracy McGuigan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3654</th>
<th>Respondent: 15454689 / Dave Herbert</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3655</th>
<th>Respondent: 15454785 / Fiona Hodges</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3656</th>
<th>Respondent: 15454849 / Charlotte Murphy</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3657</th>
<th>Respondent: 15454849 / Charlotte Murphy</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3663  Respondent: 15455073 / Amanda Fletcher  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3664  Respondent: 15455105 / Kate Robinson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3652  Respondent: 15455201 / Edith Dadswell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5602  Respondent: 15479681 / George Smith  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4463</th>
<th>Respondent: 15485601 / Tim Jewers</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to site A45 The Talbot, this is over development in Green Belt and a conservation area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4501</th>
<th>Respondent: 15486081 / Rosie Ainsworth</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4512</th>
<th>Respondent: 15486177 / Daniel Peyton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4539</th>
<th>Respondent: 15486849 / Eric Waestaff</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4545  Respondent: 15486977 / P Jefferson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4563  Respondent: 15487233 / Lindsey Schravetta  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4572  Respondent: 15487521 / A Malcmer  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4642  Respondent: 15488065 / Heather Beaver  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/4653  Respondent: 15488193 / Tracey Butler  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4667  Respondent: 15494977 / Carol Adams  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4695  Respondent: 15495201 / Viliv Viana  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4719  Respondent: 15495233 / Harriet Philips  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4727  Respondent: 15495297 / Daniel Perkin  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4738</th>
<th>Respondent: 15495361 / Therese Elizabeth Hill</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt. What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5062</th>
<th>Respondent: 15495393 / M Rendell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt. What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5063</th>
<th>Respondent: 15495457 / R Laroche</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt. What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4745</th>
<th>Respondent: 15495489 / Stephen Hill</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4753</th>
<th>Respondent: 15495585 / Cristiano Vitor De Oliveira</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt. What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5064</th>
<th>Respondent: 15495617 / Peter Elliot</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt. What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5065</th>
<th>Respondent: 15495681 / Pippa Mathews</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt. What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5068</th>
<th>Respondent: 15495777 / Michael Lowe</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4763</th>
<th>Respondent: 15495809 / Katie Critchlow</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5074</th>
<th>Respondent: 15495841 / Nicholas Fox</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5077</th>
<th>Respondent: 15495905 / Emma Marshall</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4769</th>
<th>Respondent: 15495937 / C Aruncel</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>PSLPS16/4778</td>
<td>Respondent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>PSLPS16/5079</td>
<td>Respondent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>PSLPS16/5082</td>
<td>Respondent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>PSLPS16/4784</td>
<td>Respondent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5083</td>
<td>Respondent: 15496193 / Oliver Hemmings</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5086</th>
<th>Respondent: 15496225 / Tasha Hemmings</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5088</th>
<th>Respondent: 15496257 / Charlotte Philipps</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5089</th>
<th>Respondent: 15496289 / W.A. McGregor</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5055</th>
<th>Respondent: 15496353 / P.J. McGregor</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5057  Respondent: 15496385 / Paul Bold  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5056  Respondent: 15496481 / R Frampton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5058  Respondent: 15496545 / Gillian Frampton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4814  Respondent: 15496609 / Dena Parker  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5061</th>
<th>Respondent: 15496929 / M Cozens</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4823</th>
<th>Respondent: 15496961 / Felix Jeffreson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5060</th>
<th>Respondent: 15496993 / nigel stirraker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5059</th>
<th>Respondent: 15497057 / S McMarken</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4840</th>
<th>Respondent: 15497377 / David Freeborough</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4847</th>
<th>Respondent: 15497441 / Holly Hicks</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4857</th>
<th>Respondent: 15497537 / Caroline Sheppard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4866</th>
<th>Respondent: 15497601 / Ben Hicks</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4886</td>
<td>Respondent: 15497761 / N Wadey</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4902</th>
<th>Respondent: 15497889 / Hugo Wadey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4911</th>
<th>Respondent: 15497953 / Rebecca Dougherty</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4919</th>
<th>Respondent: 15498049 / Natasha Howard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4936</td>
<td>Respondent: 15498241 / Faye Church</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4945</td>
<td>Respondent: 15498369 / Kris Steadman</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4970</td>
<td>Respondent: 15498785 / Catherine Elingworth</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5005</td>
<td>Respondent: 15499873 / Pan Illingworth</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5019</td>
<td>Respondent: 15500065 / Rachael Illingworth</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5032  Respondent: 15500513 / Alex Illingworth  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5041  Respondent: 15500801 / Morgan Schooling  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5053  Respondent: 15501217 / Luke Sarti  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5071  Respondent: 15501313 / Matthew Dougherty  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5080  Respondent: 15502049 / Paul Marshall  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5094  Respondent: 15502177 / Steve Plewis  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5100  Respondent: 15502305 / S. Gibbs  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5128  Respondent: 15502977 / Alexandra Morton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5161  Respondent: 15503105 / Beml Evans  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5167  Respondent: 15503169 / A Palitchell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5181  Respondent: 15503361 / James Pasfield  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5204  Respondent: 15503585 / B Powell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5215</th>
<th>Respondent: 15503617 / Stephen Roy</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5221</th>
<th>Respondent: 15503649 / N Ord</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5227</th>
<th>Respondent: 15503777 / Elya Koudou</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5232</th>
<th>Respondent: 15503809 / M Pratt</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT TOsite A45 The Talbot – This is overdevelopment in a conservation area and should remain protected by the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment ID: PSLPS16/5325  Respondent: 15505377 / Simon Wright  
Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45 
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5331  Respondent: 15505409 / Ian Cunningham  
Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45 
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5338  Respondent: 15505537 / Vincent Carley  
Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45 
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5344  Respondent: 15505601 / Emma Robson  
Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45 
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5479</th>
<th>Respondent: 15505761 / James McMarken</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5355</td>
<td>Respondent: 15505793 / Edward Goddard</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5365</td>
<td>Respondent: 15505921 / Andrew Forest</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5482</td>
<td>Respondent: 15506017 / Steven Ponsford</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5372</td>
<td>Respondent: 15506049 / Mandy Shoesmith</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5477  Respondent: 15506081 / Dale Miller  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5475  Respondent: 15506113 / Sheila Taylor  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5382  Respondent: 15506177 / Jean Calas-Hathaway  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5473  Respondent: 15506209 / Rosemary Richardson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5472  Respondent: 15506305 / Pamela Sadler  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5470  Respondent: 15506401 / Alicia Robinson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5469  Respondent: 15506433 / Geoffrey Robinson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5388  Respondent: 15506465 / Lisa Garner  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5394</th>
<th>Respondent: 15506625 / Ian Toft</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5407</th>
<th>Respondent: 15506657 / Teresa Laroche</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5438</th>
<th>Respondent: 15506881 / Chloe Brown</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5452</th>
<th>Respondent: 15506913 / Nicholas Mann</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment ID: PSLPS16/5467  Respondent: 15506945 / Catherine Wyatt  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5484  Respondent: 15507105 / N. Hookins  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5500  Respondent: 15507329 / Manner Kaur  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5506  Respondent: 15507457 / Andre Rose  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5512</th>
<th>Respondent: 15507489 / K Garner</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5536</th>
<th>Respondent: 15507585 / Patrick Laroche</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5542</th>
<th>Respondent: 15507617 / Ewan Collens</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5605</th>
<th>Respondent: 15507713 / Yvonne Connolly</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5604</th>
<th>Respondent: 15507745 / M Grainger</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5601</td>
<td>Respondent: 15507809 / M Smith</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5600</th>
<th>Respondent: 15507841 / Mark Fenner</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5599</th>
<th>Respondent: 15507873 / Andy Tupper</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5598</th>
<th>Respondent: 15507905 / Hannah Lewis</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5597</th>
<th>Respondent: 15507969 / Ian Draper</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5596</th>
<th>Respondent: 15508001 / Lisa Barwick</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5595</th>
<th>Respondent: 15508033 / D Worship</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5594</th>
<th>Respondent: 15508065 / Christina Worship</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5764  Respondent: 15573921 / Carolyne Jackson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site A45 The Talbot - this is overdevelopment in a conservation area. Wisley Airfield

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7376  Respondent: 15582337 / Peter Hill  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site A45 The Talbot. This is overdevelopment in a conservation area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7048  Respondent: 15584641 / Miriam Gilkerson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to the site A45 - The Talbot. This is overdevelopment in a conservation area

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6160  Respondent: 15585313 / Kim Styles  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO - The Talbot A45 overdevelopment in a conservation area

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7098  Respondent: 15585313 / Kim Styles  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT TO – The Talbot Site A45. This is overdevelopment in a conservation area.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6168  Respondent: 15585345 / Wanita Styles  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT TO – A45 THE TALBOT - OVERDEVOLPMENT IN A CONSERVATION AREA
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6175  Respondent: 15585409 / Vanessa Styles  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT TO – The Talbot Site A45. This is overdevelopment in a conservation area.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6738  Respondent: 15602113 / Janet Woodward  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT TO site A45 The Talbot – This is overdevelopment in a conservation area.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7268</th>
<th>Respondent: 15603361 / Ann Watkins</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to A45 The Talbot – this is overdevelopment in a conservation area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7105</th>
<th>Respondent: 15627329 / Loraine Crates</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to site A45 The Talbot which is in a conservation area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7372</th>
<th>Respondent: 15644577 / John Cotton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT TO site A45 The Talbot. This is overdevelopment in a conservation area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7572</th>
<th>Respondent: 15653505 / Dave Robins</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT TO site A45 The Talbot. This is overdevelopment in a conservation area. Overdevelopment in Ripley will completely spoil the feel of a village which will then be lost forever.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7611</th>
<th>Respondent: 15657121 / Robert Wheeler</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site A45 The Talbot as this is over development in a conservation area

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7832  Respondent: 15674273 / Savills for Thames Water (Katherine Jones)  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8009  Respondent: 15698753 / Anna Calvert  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site A45 The Talbot since this is a conservation area

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Burr Family and Ripley Carriage Ltd own the 0.97 hectare site on land to the Rear of the Talbot, High Street Ripley. The site is located within the heart of the Ripley settlement area and currently comprises:

1. On the frontage; land and buildings associated with the; car sales use and commercial garages;
2. To the south an area of scrubland previously used as a helicopter landing pad for the Talbot Inn Hotel (now in a separate ownership).

The frontage site has been in use for car sales and servicing by the current owner since 1971 and is currently part occupied on a small number of short term tenancies.
The Site is considered to represent the most suitable and logical piece of infill development within Ripley. Development of the site can help to address the specific local development needs for the village as well as providing an appropriate contribution to the Council’s wider District housing target. The site performs no Green Belt function in line with the NPPF tests and as evidenced by the Council’s own Evidence Base represents a suitable location for release from the Green Belt.

The village of Ripley is located to the north east of the District and represents a highly sustainable and vibrant settlement. The settlement is classified as a District Centre and is ranked ninth out of 32 settlements in the Council’s sustainability ranking of settlements, and was ranked particularly strongly in terms of; shops, other community facilities and schools (which provide both a diverse range of services and local employment opportunities).

The settlement also benefits from a village hall, recreational open space, a children’s playground, pubs, restaurants, a dentist. The village is served by a bus service and has excellent direct links to the strategic road network.

The settlement performs an important supporting function for both the immediate local community and smaller surrounding communities. The settlement is, therefore, a logical location for future growth and its needs must be appropriately planned for to maintain its status and future prosperity.

The allocation of Site A45 will help to address local housing needs and will also in part support the plan vision to focus development on brownfield sites.

The Proposals Map identifies the site for development building on the strong recommendations in the Council’s evidence base. The site is to also to be included within the amended settlement boundary alongside a recently completed residential infill development on adjoining land.

---

3 Green Belt and Countryside Study, Volume V 2014
4 Redevelopment scheme for 45 dwellings at White Hart Meadows, Ripley Ref: 12/P/00359

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  [Technical Note Site A45 inc Appendices.pdf](#) (3.6 MB)

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7744  **Respondent:** 15733697 / Ripley Carriage Ltd (The Burr Family)  **Agent:** Shrimplin Brown (James Brown)

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( )  **is Sound?** ( )  **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

**Our Client supports the inclusion of Site A45, Land at the rear of the Talbot, High Street, Ripley.**

The adjustment of the village boundary and removal of the site from the Green Belt will appropriately realign the settlement boundary to reflect the functional extent of the village. It is considered that the proposed amended boundary would be logical, robust and would create a long term defensible boundary to the Green Belt, in line with the approach set out in the Council’s Evidence Base.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  [Technical Note Site A45 inc Appendices.pdf](#) (3.6 MB)

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4557  **Respondent:** 15922337 / Andrew Malcher  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A45
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A45 The Talbot Ripley as this is over development in an open space within the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4852</th>
<th>Respondent: 17484449 / Thames Water Utilities Ltd (Sir or Madam)</th>
<th>Agent: Savills (Richard Hill)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Water Response</th>
<th>Waste Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50714</td>
<td>A45 - Land R/O The Talbot, High Street, Ripley</td>
<td>This site falls outside of Thames Water’s water supply boundary.</td>
<td>On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Total records: 231.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A46 - Land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8119  Respondent: 8556385 / Guildford Residents Association, EGRA (Amanda Mullarkey)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A46: Land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford

See comments on questions 1 to 3

See Appendix 4

Policy on green approaches needs strengthening

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5377  Respondent: 8557217 / Mrs Angela Gray  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

To The Planning Inspector of Guildford Borough Council

- I object to the 1100 homes that GBC want to build on A46 (between Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane in Normandy and Flexford). This site gets water-logged as we have natural springs at Wanborough that flow through Flexford and Normandy, not helped as the soil type here is clay. This land has always historically been agricultural and therefore ‘greenbelt’. The greenbelt is there to STOP urban sprawl. We already have low water pressure and this will only worsen.

- The approach to Wanborough station (in Normandy and on the edge of A46) gets flooded on numerous occasions each year. Rail commuters now keep a pair of wellingtons to hand as it is the only way to get through to the platforms as it gets to 15 cm deep in places and that’s more than a shoe full of dirty water. Plus there are only 8 spaces for cars to park at the station. Do not be fooled in thinking the 2,000 odd residents (average of 2 per household) will be using the ever expensive train to get to work as we know from residents currently living in Flexford and Wanborough only a small proportion use the train.

- How is the Victorian railway bridge on Glaziers Lane going to cope with an extra 1,500 plus cars going over it twice a day? There is already a crack in the brickwork.

- I object to even more cars on our busy roads. The improvements that are talked about are just not enough for such a busy area. At peak times we cannot get out at the crossroads with the A323 and Glaziers Lane. The traffic piles down Wanborough Hill in the mornings and evenings plus anytime there is an accident on the A31 and A3.

- I object to the burden that will be added to the Doctor’s surgery where already we have to wait for 2 weeks for an appointment to see the doctor. This will also have an enormous knock on effect at the Royal Surrey where waiting times will get even longer to see a consultant or have an operation, goodness knows how A&E will cope with sites like Blackwell Farm and Slyfield possibly being developed.

- I object to having a Secondary School built on land A46 which is red sensitive land. It is ludicrous as we only have around 50 children of secondary school age currently in Normandy and Flexford. So this can only mean it...
is developer led as the other 1000 odd spaces will be for children outside of our village. Currently Ash Manor and Kings College are under subscribed. The thought of children being driven by parents and bused in to Normandy is going to put even greater pressure on our roads around the village, don’t think they’ll cycle as their parents will not let them go the distance on our dangerous busy pot holed roads.

- People currently living in Normandy and Flexford chose to pay a premium to live here because of the rural setting in the greenbelt. As all know who live in the village at peak times it is difficult to get up Wanborough Hill, and turn (especially right towards Guildford) out of the village from Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane. As soon as there is an accident on the A3, A31, A331 and the A323 the village becomes gridlocked. This would only get worse with 1,100 new homes with an average of 2 cars per house (taking into account some may only have one car and others may have children living with them driving). It is an unthinkable thought. Anyone living at the Flexford end of the village has to cross Glaziers Lane 3 times, where footpaths disappear (before and after the railway bridge and on the bend where the stream goes under the road). So mums with pushchairs and toddlers have to negotiate this traffic problem to get the nursery school on Glaziers Lane, the doctors surgery and village hall.

- Looking at the plan for the area of SANG provision on a field that sits on clay so in the winter it is soggy underfoot and would soon get all churned up from dog walkers. Did you know that 24% of homeowners have dogs and 17% cats (Found on PFMA Pet food manufacturers website)? I am a dog owner and I do not walk the fields around the village between October and March due to clay becoming claggy so difficult to walk in and my dog getting filthy. I go to the Normandy part of the Ash Ranges which happens to be SSSI where I can walk my dog on lovely drained heathland. I love it so much over there that I actually walk it throughout the year. If these houses get built it will not take long for the owners who have dogs to work out that 1 km away there is a lovely dry walk. With all these additional dog owners trampling over the SSSI has the following red listed birds dartford warbler, woodlark, tree pipit and nightjar (all ground nesters) plus linnet and lesser redpoll and migrants cuckoo, whinchat and hen harrier. Our heath land is also important for the rare smooth snake, sand lizard and heath tiger beetle (all are only found on Surrey, Hampshire and Dorset heathland). It would be the fault of GBC if numbers in these rare species start declining due to this huge housing estate being built far too close to a SSSI site.

- Our bats use the land in question to forage and nest in the trees and barn owls use the fields to hunt prey. Plus there is likely to be the arboreal dormouse in the Ancient woodland on sites at Pussey’s and Walden’s Copse. Normandy has a good population of hedgehogs a heavily declining species which needs up to 2 km of foraging with interconnecting garden routes to roam, they will not survive such a huge development taking place and then the gardens of new homes are so small that many tend to just deck or patio over which has zero habitat for them and other wildlife.

- My husband and I bought our house 23 years ago in the village when there were 5 shops and 3 pubs. These were never used enough to make viable businesses so they all eventually closed. Those who have got cars can now use the village mini bus for shopping trips, internet shopping/food deliveries is huge in Normandy and Flexford. So there is no point in providing any new shops/pubs as we didn’t use them before.

- I object to yet more [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it] traveller pitches on site A46. What can I say, do the numbers and you will see that Normandy has a large community [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it] already living off the A323 and travellers site at Cobbett Hill plus Palm Nurseries [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature]

- To conclude there is only one thing that is pushing this and that is greedy developers who by all accounts has written and made phone calls to residents backing onto Glaziers Lane to try and get them to sell their houses and gardens so they can be knocked down for new road access entrances onto the proposed site. GREED is pushing this development and it’s about time that us villagers have our voice’s heard. GBC have been heard to say they would prefer to be dealing with one large developer than lots of smaller ones which will take up more time. Well what an excuse, for something that will ruin the villages and approach to Guildford. I feel that if every village took a small number of housing say between 50 and 100 each it is a much fairer way.

- Has GBC thought about using the brownfield sites in Guildford to build affordable flats or apartments that those living there can then either walk to their place of work in Guildford or walk to the Guildford Mainline station.
that then opens up to get them to Woking, London, Portsmouth etc for work? I feel that Guildford does not need any more retail shops it has plenty and we have enough businesses. Really and truly businesses should be looking to move up north where sites are cheaper to buy and there is high unemployment so gives communities a chance for work again.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The Parish Council opposes the principle of the development of this site:

(1) The site lies within the Green Belt, and has been assessed by Guildford Borough Council (GBC) as having high sensitivity in Green Belt terms, serving to check the southward sprawl of Normandy and northward sprawl of Flexford, preventing the merger of those settlements, and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment (see Green Belt Purposes Assessment, April 2014). Accordingly, given the very significant contribution made by the site to the Green Belt in this area, it should not be developed.

(2) The development of the site would not amount to sustainable development within the meaning of the National Planning Policy Framework. GBC’s claim that the approach would be sustainable fails to attach any or any meaningful weight to the environmental aspects of sustainability.

(3) The proposed allocation has not been the subject of any proper assessment of highways impacts. The local road network is incapable of coping with the proposed scale of development and there is no evidence that the necessary highways improvements are feasible or deliverable within the plan period.

(4) The site lies within 1 km of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area and accordingly requires substantial provision of alternative green space as an avoidance strategy. Preferable sites for development elsewhere could be delivered without such provision.

The development of this site would significantly affect Normandy and the surrounding area and has not been justified in the Local Plan or in the supporting documents. In addition to the principled objections to the development set out above, the Parish Council considers that there have been substantial flaws in the plan-making process to date which go to both the merits and legality of the Local Plan.

Specific criticisms of the plan making process

A sound plan must be based on proper evidence and consistent with national policy. To be lawful, the plan must be promoted on the basis of a proper analysis of the environmental impacts of policies together with an assessment of reasonable alternatives (see Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004/1633 and e.g. Calverlon PC v Nottingham City Council [2015] EWHC 1078 (Admin), per Jay J at (67)).

The history of the Local Plan is known to GBC. The Parish Council wishes to emphasise that in the 2014 plan, it was not proposed that this site be allocated for development. Since then, there has been no further Green Belt review, but there has been a Green Belt Purposes Assessment which identified this site as particularly sensitive in Green Belt terms.

There is no explanation in the published documents of the "exceptional circumstances" (NPPF, 80) that are said to justify release of the site from the Green Belt. The Green Belt Capacity Study does not explain why such exceptional circumstances exist, and nor does the Sustainability Appraisal ("SA"). Extraordinarily, the SA states that the development of the site is regarded as a "given" (6.3.16). The SA acknowledges (in footnote 68, p 131) the greater impacts on the Green Belt in developing sites such as this, but does not explain why such development is nonetheless justified on both environmental grounds and by reference to the exceptional circumstances test.

The SA is open to further criticism through its failure to accord any weight to the Green Belt in analysing various options. This is a significant deficiency which renders the SA unsound and indeed unlawful, since the alternatives are not subjected to proper analysis on environmental grounds.

Further, GBC has consulted on the Local Plan with the proviso that this site should be deleted from the plan should it be demonstrated the provision of a secondary school on the site is not required.

However, there has been no proper assessment of whether alternative sites could accommodate the school, as is clearly required given the "exceptional circumstances" test. GBC’s assessment of alternative secondary school sites notes that Surrey County Council's concerns as to remoteness of the site from development are as was only overcome by the new housing provision in the Local Plan i.e. that housing which is proposed on this site. The alternatives assessment fails to
identify the land area required for the school, and fails to assess alternative sites on the basis of their contribution (or otherwise) to the Green Belt. This is a fundamentally flawed sequential assessment.

Even if this site is the only possible school site (which is not accepted) then there is no explanation as to why 1,100 houses are required to be delivered in addition to the school, with a materially greater impact on the Green Belt and the environment generally. Part of the justification offered for the selection of this site for a school is that it is close to the proposed housing (together with other development sites). This argument is circular, since if the school is not required in this location then nor is the housing. In any event, this justification does not compare alternative sites on a fair basis, since other sites are rejected for schools on the basis of their Green Belt location. This site also lies within the Green Belt.

The Leader of GBC has suggested that the proposed houses should be regarded as "enabling development". The Parish Council submits that school funding should be achieved through the normal channels and not through the release of Green Belt land to housing development. This suggested cross-subsidy is an unjustified claim (there has been no viability analysis) and in any event is not a proper planning reason for allocating the site for development. The Local Plan is therefore unsound.

Next Steps

GBC's consultation on the Local Plan was based on the proviso that policy A46 was to be deleted in the absence of justification for the location of a secondary school at the site.

The Parish Council has seen no proper justification for the location of a secondary school in this Green Belt site. The selection of the site appears to have been justified on the basis that it will be close to the housing identified in the allocation. This makes for an entirely circular argument; the housing is only put forward on the basis of the school, and the school on the basis of the housing.

This cannot amount to an exceptional circumstance for the release of land from the Green Belt. There has been no adequate sequential site assessment for a new secondary school.

In those circumstances, GBC is invited to confirm that policy A46 will be deleted from the Local Plan because the school location has not been justified. The Spatial Strategy should be amended accordingly.

We await GBC's urgent confirmation that the Local Plan will not be proceeding with Policy A46 and that the land in question will remain within the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Removal of sites A46 and A47.
We support the removal of these sites from the 2016 Plan. They were strongly opposed by Councillors and residents on the basis that they would have irretrievably destroyed the character of Normandy and Flexford, and would have imposed an impossible burden on the local transport and other infrastructure.
We are glad that GBC has taken note of the many objections to these proposed sites, and also of the findings of the revised Sustainability Appraisal 2017, and removed them from the Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

attached documents:

I object strongly to the strategic development in Normandy/Flexford, Policy A46 in the plan.

Boundaries of A46

I am confused about the boundaries and size of A46. The developers have produced a Site Concept Master Plan, but the boundaries are different to, and the site would seem to be a little bigger than , the site set out in GBC's Submission Plan on Page 231. The developer's plan stretches further to the east, and GBC's stretches further to the north. I have worked with GBC's boundaries, although I believe they are incorrect in relation to the extension to the north.

In the Settlement Hierarchy Normandy scored highly for sustainability, largely for its community spirit, rather than facilities. Flexford had only open green space and a station. GBC would seem to be set on damaging the most sustainable aspect of Normandy, its community spirit, by doubling the size of the village. The infrastructure at present is adequate for the population, the proposed 'infill will do nothing to improve sustainability rather it will place further pressure on infrastructure by way of lack of sufficient transport'. Flexford is even worse off. It will lose its green space and the train will be much more crowded; standing or no place at all at peak times. There is insufficient room to allow access from both sides of the platforms or parking. In addition situation of the station next to the blind hump backed bridge set on a squint over the line will prevent safe access and egress to it in the proposed far greater numbers

In exchange Normandy and Flexford get shops, which they don't need and will not be used. I have to express complete frustration with GBC who have been told of the survey prepared by the Village in advance of a neighbourhood Plan. Residents think a shop is a nice idea but will not use it which is why in the last 15 years 3 shops and a post office have closed, 2 pubs and a garage. The provision of shops will not add to the sustainability of the village and will, as have others, go broke.

Objections

1. This strategic site is not based on evidence, as required by the NPPF, but by a developer-led plan which offers a free school. In essence, GBC is agreeing to a proposal to build a large secondary school in the Green Belt, where the roads are inadequate, public transport overstretched, where there are only 20 children resident in the area. The infrastructure is overloaded and there is no opportunity to cycle or walk or to school. A school of such a size would involve travel to and from the area of 1200 pupils and 300 staff.

There is no need for another secondary school in West Guildford. In 2013 the draft Sustainability Appraisal specifically stated that there was adequate secondary school provision throughout the Borough, except Central Guildford. The GBC 2013 Plan contained the sites at Blackwell Farm and Ash. So what has changed between 2013 and 2016?
The number of houses in Blackwell Farm has been reduced from 2,250 to 1,800.

The number of developments in Ash has been reduced, but a strategic site of 67ha has been added, so it is difficult to compare, but the number of hectares available for development has been reduced. So why, if there was not a shortage of secondary school places in 2013, is there one now? The children from the Normandy/Flexford site should not be included in the numbers, as it would be in contradiction to logic (a circular argument, the school exists because of the children who exist because of the school). If a school is needed for children in Ash then it should be built in Ash on a small amount of the additionally set aside land

1. It uses Green Belt Land without proving exceptionality. The land used by this site has been assessed as the most sensitive Green Belt by GBC. (NPPF 89)
2. The Infrastructure required is not there

The A323, the road that passes through Normandy, is nearing capacity. Significant new developments further west (Wellesley Place in Aldershot and at Ash) will place additional strain on this road. Improvements to the A323 through Normandy are not due until 2021 - 2026. The budget allocated is small. Their nature is unspecified and they are not guaranteed. Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane form the borders of the Normandy/Flexford Site. Westwood Lane, C16, is a narrow country lane on which two entrances into the Normandy/Flexford site are planned. It is single lane at the rail bridge which is offset and height limited. Glaziers Lane, D60, is even narrower and there are no planned improvements. Glaziers Lane features narrow entry and egress onto the A323 and a hump back bridge over the railway also set at an angle with blind summit obscuring the access and egress from Wanborough Station

The Normandy/Flexford site is considered sustainable because it is next to Wanborough station. Children from Ash attending the school and commuters to Guildford are expected to use the train. The train will not provide the level of service suggested, as it is already busy at peak times, and as the AUE develops, will be full when it leaves Aldershot, before calling at Ash, Wanborough and Guildford. The Platforms cannot accommodate long trains. It is not accessible for disabled users and is unmanned. It is sited next to Ancient Woodland and could not accommodate even medium scale redevelopment. It has 8 parking spaces and provides access to a builders yard

Policy A46 emphasises travel by bus, train and bike, but the reality is that owing to shortcomings in these modes of transport, at least 1,000 residents’ cars will stream in and out of this site at peak times. Additionally a significant proportion of pupils and staff of the secondary school (1,200 pupils and 300 staff) will have to use a car to get to school. Even with the anticipated improvements to the A323 and Westwood Lane, the effect on the roads will be severe.

The junctions of both roads with the A323 and the A31 Hogs back cannot be improved. The A31 junction would involve changing road through what is at present AGLV but which is expected to be changed to AONB as it is presently recommended for approval as such. The A323 junctions would involve demolition of buildings one of which is a SNCI containing a Grade11 listed tomb.

The proposed site for Travelling Showmans Guild is another ‘sweetener’ offered by the developer, which is illogical. Normandy has a successfully integrated site on the Guildford Road at A50 Whittles Drive. It was only a few years back that the owner of the adjacent land offered the land for Travellers pitches but this was refused. If expansion is needed then enquiries should be made there. Although the owners of A 50 find it difficult to manoeuvre their equipment (fairground rides) into Whittles Drive they would find it impossible to do so to gain access to A46. I have no objection to expansion of the site at A50

The NPPF 30 and 35 refer

1. Heritage Assets

it is a core principle of the NPPF to conserve heritage assets so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations. There are seven Grade II listed buildings and one Grade II listed tomb adjoining or close to, this site. The houses are: Westwood Place, Buckhurst, Great Westwood, Halsey's Cottage and Glaziers. The other buildings are: Great Westwood Barn and St Mary's Church. The tomb is the Pirbright Tomb. Glaziers and Westwood Place face particular threats, none of which are recognised in the Plan. Glaziers is within 25m of the site,
red for development in GBC’s Sustainability Scoping paper. Westwood Place faces the proposed site upon which a line of ancient oaks marks the approach to the house.

I attach a map showing the sites which also includes sites of National Archaeological Importance and potential archaeological importance. No consideration has been given in this plan as to how these historic buildings will be protected once the greenbelt protection is removed. Indeed I believe they will be damaged.

It is important to note that the owners of the land have allowed hedges to grow without restraint in the last few years since GBC started to make enquiries about available land. This has masked the openness of the site and interfered with the setting of the houses. This can however be remedied

(NPPF 126)

1. The Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area

The threat to the SPA from the proposed site has not been given enough weight. Two entrances to the SPA are within easy reach of the site, Dolley’s Hill (600m) and Nightingale Road (1k).

Dog walking is of particular concern to SPA managers for the damage they do to the SPA. It can be expected that a large number of residents will have dogs, the pet of choice in the countryside, and will require somewhere to walk them. However good the SANG provided, it is inevitable that a good number of dog-walkers will prefer to walk their dogs on the SPA, especially in winter, as the SPA is dry and land in Normandy is wet. A46 will harm the SPA

(NPPF 113 and 117 point 3 and 118 point 1)

1. Degradation of Ancient Woodland and Ancient Trees and loss of Biodiversity

Ancient Trees, registered on the Ancient Trees Inventory, are at risk of damage from children, cats and dogs, pollution and the building work required to develop the site.

There is ancient woodland both on the site and adjoining it. Both will be degraded by cat predation. The woodland on site will be further damaged by children and pollution.

St Mark’s Churchyard SNCI is within 400m of the site. This SNCI contains the rare Green Winged Orchid, which is sensitive to disturbance. I do not hold out any hope of these rare plants surviving the building work. Normandy Common SNCI and Normandy Pond SNCI will be affected by pollution. Surrounding this site are many UK BAP sites, which will be disturbed by the initial build in particular, birds being especially vulnerable. There is a Traditional Orchard BOA bordering the site.

The SANG will not compensate for this loss of biodiversity, nor will the gardens of the development, which will not provide the openness required by many bird species that currently use the site. If this development goes ahead Normandy will have a net loss of Biodiversity of approx 46ha. (NPPF 118 point 1 and 109 point 3)

1. Loss of Agricultural Land

This land is currently farmed. It is mostly hay meadow, with some pigs and horses. It is Grade 3 agricultural land. The Government places a high priority on using lower grade agricultural for building, and retaining other grades for food production. This Grade 3 land should remain in agriculture. Historically this land was farmed as Market Garden and alongside fruit and nut orchards, remnants of which appear in the hedgerows, supplied Guildford and Aldershot. Following Brexit GBC should be slow to discount this valuable asset (NPPF 112)

1. Flooding

The site is Flood Risk 2 and Flood Risk 3 in places. The site is one of the sources of the Hoe Stream (NPPF 100). The sewerage system appears to be already running at capacity and could not cope with the proposed development. Footnote 9 for NPPF policy 14 indicates that development in locations at risk of flooding such as at Normandy/Flexford should be restricted.
1. Degradation of the view from the Hog's Back AONB

GBC’s POLICY P1 states that. All proposals will be considered against whether they conserve and/or enhance the setting and views of the AONB.

The best views from the Hog's Back along the A31 are to the North, towards Normandy. A46 will bring a large expanse of taller buildings with street lights. In summer the site will be partially hidden by trees, but at night it will be clearly visible, and also in winter when the trees are bare. Light pollution and dense housing will spoil the view from the Hog's Back. This development will neither conserve nor enhance the AONB, but will harm it. It is sad but the view to the South of the Hogs Back is totally obscured along the whole of its length (NPPF 115).

Summary

The need for school on this site has not been arrived at by means of evidence. A46 is not sustainable. In my view there are seven contradictions to principles in the NPPF. Some of these cite exceptional need as a reason for ignoring the principle, however, is it reasonable to ignore loss of Biodiversity and likely damage to the SPA and spoiling the view from the Hogs Back and Flood Risk 2 & 3 and spoiling Grade II listed houses and losing agricultural land?

I consider that the Transport arrangements mitigate wholly against the use of this site for any of the purposes claimed.

I am at a loss as to how the current residents of Normandy and Flexford will benefit from this plan, or in what way Normandy and Flexford will be more sustainable.


What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7903  Respondent: 8596673 / Peta Malthouse  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the removal of the land allocated in Policy A46 from the Green Belt by “inset” being that land presently defined in the 2003 Plan as the ‘settlement area’ and it’s extension (NPPF para 83 and 84).

No “exceptional circumstances/very special circumstances” have been given in support of this which redraws the Green Belt boundary for the land in Policy A46 for the present properties along the Guildford Road/Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane by extension and removal from Green Belt.

I believe the position set out in 2003 Plan should be retained and that the whole of Administrative Normandy (Christmaspie, Flexford, Pinewoods, Willey Green and Normandy) should remain washed over by the greenbelt.

Once a Green Belt has been established and approved, it requires more than general planning concepts to justify an alteration.”

No “exceptional circumstances “for such re-drawing of boundaries have been offered by GBC in the context of the Local Plan process, so how can residents judge the veracity of this proposal?

The effect would be to urbanise the 2 settlements and destroy the openness and character of this important Green Belt site(s).

SUMMARY
• GBC state that the Town Centre is the most sustainable location to build. The majority of development in is the Green Belt.
• GBC state that they will focus on brownfield development; the majority of building is on greenfield sites in the Green Belt.
• GBC make a priority of Biodiversity. Policy A47 plans to build on an SNCl. The amount of green space is the Borough is reduced by 218ha.
• GBC’s policy is infrastructure first, development later. Policy A46 - the developer hopes to deliver in 1-5 years. The infrastructure improvements, minor as they are, will not start until 2021.
• GBC states that they will work with neighbouring Boroughs as the Duty to Co-operate requires. The first commuters from the AUE (Rushmoor) will use the A323 from 2016. Improvements to the A323 start later. The improvements to the A323 will be insufficient to mitigate this increased traffic in any event. There appears to be no consultation with Rushmoor.

To be credible, GBC need to set out policies and then meet them.

Their policies regarding use of greenbelt for housing and Travellers is flawed as no ‘exceptional circumstances’ have been given to support this. They have used the construct of insetting in order to try and push the ability to deliver on housing and Traveller pitch numbers without justification and failed to understand that the greenbelt should be applied as a constraint to those figures with encouragement to make better use of the land already allocated to Urban development in Ash, Tongham and Guildford Town. Brownfield sites in these areas are already sufficient to meet any agreed target.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: Map of Normandy showing sites of concern.docx (4.4 MB)
Image.jpg (586 KB)

Comment ID: pslp172/2395  Respondent: 8598785 / Mr Roger Parslow  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.

• With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become even more biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:


Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Representation on Policy A46: Land to the South of Normandy and North of Flexford
Introduction

This representation is submitted on behalf of Countryside Properties in response to the Council’s decision to elevate Land to the South of Normandy and North of Flexford (Policy A46) from a safeguarded site in the Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan to a Strategic Site Allocation in the Regulation 19 Proposed Submission Local Plan.

The site is 67 hectares in areas and comprises numerous fields, 4 parcels of ancient woodland and 2 public footpaths which traverse the site. It has been identified in the Submission Local Plan as a residential led mixed use development allocation for:

- Approximately 1,100 homes (C3), including some specialist housing and self-build plots (C3), and
- A nursing or residential care home (C2) with approximately 60 beds, and
- 6 Travelling Showpeople plots (sui generis), and
- Approximately 400 sq m of comparison retail (A1), and
- Approximately 300 sq m of convenience retail (A1), and
- Approximately 400 sq m of services (A2 – A5), and
- Approximately 300 sq m of community facilities (D1), and
- A secondary school (D1) (up to eight form entry), and
- A village green.

Background

In the Issues and Options Consultation (October 2013) the Council identified that it could consider an option to significantly expand an existing village, with possible areas including land between Flexford and Normandy.

In July 2014 the Council undertook a twelve week public consultation on the Draft Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites. Land between Flexford and Normandy was identified in this document as Safeguarded Land (site reference 119) to meet the longer terms development needs stretching beyond the plan period. The Draft Plan proposed that the land be removed from the Green Belt but would only be considered for development through a local plan review.

In this regard, the Council’s Green Belt and Countryside Study (GBCS) Vol II (February 2013) had identified this land parcel (H12) as being of “high sensitivity” to development when considering Green Belt purposes. The GBCS recognised that the land met 3 of the 4 assessed Green Belt purposes, being that it:

Checks sprawl of Normandy and Flexford;

Prevents Normandy and Flexford from merging; and

Assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

Whilst only safeguarded for future development in the Draft Guildford Local Plan in recognition of its sensitivity, land between Flexford and Normandy has now been identified as a strategic site in the Proposed Submission Local Plan (Policy A46). In this regard, the Committee Report to Full Council (24 May 2016) explains in para 4.12:

“In considering different sites within these spatial options, we have relied upon the findings of the GBCS. The GBCS identifies Potential Development Areas (PDAs) that could potentially be removed from the Green Belt for development, without harming the main purposes of the Green Belt. The draft Local Plan (2014) treated all PDAs as reasonable options for development. However, following the feedback from consultation and the new evidence available, we have reconsidered how Green Belt is used as a constraint. The draft Local Plan seeks to give weight to the sensitivity of the Green Belt parcel within which each PDA is located. Whilst PDAs have been identified on the basis that they would not fundamentally harm the main purposes of the Green Belt, there would nevertheless be, in relative terms, more harm caused by allocating sites within land parcels assessed as contributing more towards the purposes of the Green Belt.”

The Report goes on to explain in para 4.19 that “whilst the Green Belt sensitivity methodology is applicable as a general principle, consideration must be given to wider sustainability factors”, and then goes on to identify “exception” sites on this basis. This includes the land between Normandy and Flexford which “is located in a red (high) sensitivity land parcel”.
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To justify its allocation as an exception, the Report explains in para 19 (bullet 3) that the key factors which have determined the site allocation at Normandy are:

“Green Belt – site identified in the GBCS as a potential development area with defensible boundaries.

Site is promoted for mixed use development, is deliverable and viable.

The location is one that would benefit from additional housing. Both Normandy and Flexford have lost local facilities, such as shops and a public house because there are insufficient populations to support them.

Infrastructure

The site will deliver a local centre with community and retail facilities, and a village green.

Provision of specialist accommodation (care home and Travelling Showpeople plots).

Provision of a secondary school to meet future needs of the west area of Guildford borough (both natural population growth and need arising from the planned new housing).

Proximity to the existing rail station and plans to improve the frequency of the service. This would serve both Normandy and Flexford residents and be used by pupils accessing the secondary school.

Capacity of the site is able to accommodate the level of associated infrastructure.

Educational need arising from our spatial strategy for the west of the borough (up to 8 forms of entry). This is principally development at Ash/Tongham, Blackwell Farm, west Guildford town and the Normandy site itself (1 form of entry).

The secondary school is located in an easily accessible location to both Ash/Tongham and Guildford – it is therefore best able to serve the catchment area.

Such a development could make both Normandy and Flexford villages more sustainable.

In the following sections, we consider the soundness of the key factors that have led to the Council making an exception to its key principles when identifying the land between Normandy and Flexford (Site A46) as a Strategic Site.

**Green Belt**

As identified above, the Council’s GBCS identifies that this land parcel is considered to be of high sensitivity to development. It also confirms that its development would inevitably compromise all but one of the five Green Belt purposes identified in the NPPF.

The GBCS goes on, however, to suggest in Vol V (when considering the land as a potential major development area (PMDA)) that the development would not significantly affect the openness of the Green Belt at this location within the Borough. In reaching this conclusion it identifies that the site “is generally enclosed by woodlands, treebelts, hedgerows and the railway line to the south. Woodland at Waldens Copse and Pusseys Copse provides a high level of visual screening within the PMDA.”

We consider that this simplified consideration of ‘openness’ in relation to general views into Site A46 from the wider area fails to take account of the scale of proposed built development across, what is described in the Council’s Landscape Character Assessment as, a peaceful rural landscape, with a gently rolling landform, substantial areas of ancient woodland of high biodiversity value and a sparse settlement pattern. Having visited the site, we agree with the findings of the Landscape Character Assessment, having noted its tranquil nature and scenic quality but also its function as a rural setting to scattered and fragmented built development. We also identified wide open views across the site from Westwood Lane to the northwest, and from the public footpaths crossing the site.

Built development guidelines within the Council’s Landscape Character Assessment advocate the conservation of this fragmented landscape including the surviving areas of open farmland with scattered farmsteads; the retention of
individual settlements avoiding merging these through dense linear development along roads, for instance Flexford and Normandy; the retention of gaps in linear development (for instance between Great Westwood and Flexford); avoiding the location of any new large mass of development or bulky structures where overly visually intrusive on this character area; and the conservation of the views south to the rural, unsettled ridge of the Hog's Back. The Council have therefore clearly been inconsistent with the its own build development guidelines in choosing to allocate Site A46.

Recent proposals for much smaller developments on land in the immediate vicinity of Site A46 have been refused by the Council on grounds that the quantum of urban development would be harmful to the openness of the Green Belt and the landscape character of the area. The first application for 90 units has subsequently been considered by an Inspector at appeal and he also concluded that "given the largely undeveloped nature of the site and the scale and nature of the proposed development, it seems to me that the development would have a considerable impact in this respect [openness] and I attach substantial weight to this harm." In dismissing the appeal, the Inspector also concluded that the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the rural settlement.

The conclusions reached in the GBCS with respect to the insignificant impact of Site A46 on the openness of the Green Belt are therefore clearly questionable in view of recent decisions reached by the Council and the Planning Inspectorate for much smaller developments in the immediate vicinity of the site. We therefore consider that the harm to the openness of the Green Belt has been understated in the identification of the site as a Potential Major Development Area in the GBCS.

Deliverability and Viability, including infrastructure provision

It is noted from the Council’s Land Availability Assessment (February 2016) that in order to support the development of Site A46, there would need to be a significant investment in infrastructure. The infrastructure requirements identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2016) include:

- Potential upgrades to the capacity of local electricity, water supply and wastewater networks;
- A bespoke SANG to mitigate the impact of the development on the SPA;
- Improvements to the B3000/A31 junction (est cost £1 million);
- A323 Guildford Road traffic management and environmental improvement scheme (est cost £1 million);
- Westwood Lane traffic management and environmental improvement scheme (est cost £0.8 million);
- Significant bus network improvements to key destinations;
- Provision of an offsite cycle network to key destinations;
- Flood risk reduction measures in Orchard Close by railway line at Wanborough Station;
- Provision of on-site Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems to minimise flood risk (the site adjoins a surface water flooding hotspot area (Flexford) as set out in the Guildford surface water management plan);
- Open space including park, playground and playing fields;
- Contributions to the expansion of Wyke Primary School to serve the site (construction costs £5m); and
- Contributions and provision of serviced land for a 7fe secondary school (construction costs £20m).

The list of infrastructure required to support the development is clearly extensive and the costs will be substantial. Beyond the above, draft Policy A46 also requires the proposed allocation to deliver a local centre with community and retail facilities, a village green, and the provision of specialist accommodation (care home and Travelling Showpeople plots).
This extensive list of infrastructure is required to drastically improve the sustainability credentials of a rural location currently lacking in service provision. It is therefore evident that the timely delivery of infrastructure at Site A46 is essential if the Local Plan’s fundamental objective of delivering Sustainable Development is to be met. Yet, despite this, we are not aware of any viability study that has been undertaken to demonstrate that the strategic allocation is deliverable and viable with the level of infrastructure required.

Sustainability

We’ve noted above that a significant amount of new infrastructure is needed to support the scale of development envisaged by Policy A46 given the existing deficit in the adjacent settlements of Normandy and Flexford. In fact, Normandy and Flexford scored low (score 9) in terms of the total community facilities and was ranked 10th in terms of the sustainability assessments within the Council’s settlement hierarchy.

To consider this further, we have produced a Site Comparison Table (Appendix 5.1) which compares the sustainability credentials of the site with our Client’s land at New Pond Road, Farncombe. This has been informed by the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Guildford Proposed Submission Local Plan, although we have, where necessary, amended the scorings to address inaccuracies that we have noted with respect to our Client’s site. This includes correcting the distance to the nearest Primary School as the SA suggests this is less than 2km, when in fact it is less than 1km. We have also identified from available MAFF records that our Client’s land contains Grade 3 agricultural land, as opposed to Grade 1 land which is identified in the SA.

Below we set out our key conclusions when comparing Site A46 with our Client’s site:

Site A44 scored poorly (red) in relation to 5 sustainability criteria, whereas our Client’s site only scored poorly in 3 criteria.

Site A44 is further from a key employment site, recreation facilities, a primary school, and secondary school than our Client’s site.

Site A44 is closer to a European Site (SPA and SAC) than our Client’s site.

Our Client’s site scored worse than A44 with respect to flood risk, and its location within the AONB, however we have demonstrated in our site specific representation in relation to our Client’s site (Section 3) that it makes limited to no contribution to the special qualities and features of the Surrey Hills AONB, and that the area of the site within a flood zone has been agreed with the Environment Agency and will be left undeveloped.

In justifying Site A46 as an exemption the Council contend that the development would make both Normandy and Flexford more sustainable. This may be the case, but as noted above it is at the expense of highly sensitive gap between the two settlements. The separate identity of these villages would also be compromised as, in effect, a new settlement would be formed. We note that the promoter of the site submitted a Concept Masterplan (Drawing No. CSa/2516/101 Rev A) in response to the Regulation 18 Local Plan consultation that sought to address this issue through seeking to locate residential blocks at the edges of the site adjacent to the existing parts of the settlements. However, the result of this is a perpetuation of the disjointed nature of the settlement pattern in the area that would fail to achieve a cohesive and sustainable new development. This is demonstrated by drawing 1325.01 enclosed as Appendix 5.2, which highlights the fragmented layout of the blocks of development proposed on the Concept Masterplan.

Furthermore, we contend that the majority of infrastructure required is there to mitigate the effects of the development, rather than enhance the vitality of Normandy and Flexford as rural communities.

A further justification provided by the Council for a strategic allocation in this location is the proximity to the existing rail station and plans to improve the frequency of the service on the North Downs Line.

In this regard, we consider that Council should take note of the findings of a recent report from the Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI)5 which challenges the assumption that building in the Green Belt around railway stations would see the majority of new residents using the train to get to jobs in London. The RTPI examined commuting data for five medium-
sized towns within the existing Metropolitan Green Belt, towns which are centred around railway stations and have direct connections to central London. It found that in these five towns, only 7.4% of commuters actually travel to inner London by train on a regular basis, despite living within easy walking or cycling distance of a station. The majority of commuters (72%) instead travel by private vehicle, mostly driving to jobs within their hometown and to other places not in London.

The study therefore suggests that new settlement developments next to railway stations are not necessarily sustainable and actually add to traffic congestion because only a small proportion of the population use the station to get to work.

Also, the Council’s LAA (February 2016) notes that opportunities to improve the stations facilities, such as parking and cycle storage, would need to be explored alongside improved connectivity to the station. It is questionable whether this is feasible in view of the limited space available surrounding the existing station.

Summary and Conclusion

Despite being described within the Council’s Green Belt and Countryside Study as a highly sensitive land parcel, Site A46 has been identified as an exception by the Council to its general approach of choosing potential development areas that cause least harm to the Green Belt. It has done so on the basis that it considers there to be key factors concerning the deliverability and sustainability credentials of the site. It has also been suggested by the Council that the development would not significantly affect the openness of the Green Belt at this location within the Borough.

We have demonstrated in these representations that the conclusions reached with respect to the insignificant impact of Site A46 on the openness of the Green Belt are clearly questionable in view of recent decisions reached by the Council and the Planning Inspectorate for much smaller developments in the vicinity of the site. We consider that the harm to the openness of the Green Belt has been understated in the identification of the site as a Potential Major Development Area in the GBCS.

We have also noted that an extensive list of infrastructure is required to drastically improve the sustainability credentials of the proposed allocation in view of the significant deficit in service provision in the local area. The timely delivery of this infrastructure is clearly essential to achieve sustainable development, yet we are not aware of any viability study that demonstrates that the strategic allocation is deliverable and viable with the level of infrastructure required.

Lastly, we have questioned the Council’s contention that the development would make both Normandy and Flexford more sustainable. This would be at the expense of highly sensitive gap between the two settlements. The separate identity of these villages would be compromised and the promoters attempt to address this issue instead would result in a perpetuation of the fragmented nature of the settlement pattern in the area that would fail to achieve a cohesive and sustainable new development.

We have also suggested that the majority of infrastructure required is there to mitigate the effects of the development, rather than enhance the vitality of Normandy and Flexford as rural communities, and also challenged the assumption that the presence of the railway station will achieve the level of sustainable transport use that is anticipated.

Test of Soundness

We consider that there is a risk of the Local Plan being found unsound with the proposed allocation of Site A46 because it is not ‘consistent with national policy, as its development will be harmful to the Green Belt and would fail to achieve sustainable development. It will also not be ‘justified’, or ‘effective’, as it does not represent the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, and there is doubt over its deliverability.

Proposed Changes

In view of the above considerations, we believe that the Land to the South of Normandy and North of Flexford (Site A46) should be removed from the Local Plan prior to submission for Examination.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
We acknowledge the need to build more housing to meet the need of the population, but we must object strongly to the large scale developments planned for Normandy and Flexford.

We are not opposed to in-filling, utilising brown-fill sites or very small scale developments. Young people of the village cannot afford the existing housing and need one or two bedroom properties.

Our objections are based on :- 1Geology

Normandy lies on the northern slopes of the Hogs Back. The soil on this side is clay which does not drain well when there are the frequent heavy storms. To add to this problem there are seven springs which mean that the risk of flooding can occur in days after a storm.

At the moment the water table in this area is very high, so exacerbating the flooding issue. The evidence of the high water table is obvious along the south side of the A323 where the trees on the verge are permanently in water. This is a potential danger to traffic using the road, as the roots of the trees are being undermined. They could fall at any time not only blocking the road, but causing an accident by falling on a passing car.

The sewage system in Normandy is under perpetual strain and after heavy rain properties have been flooded not only with water but, with raw sewage. Large scale development and the increased areas under concrete would have repercussions not only for the existing properties, but would cause more disruption to the frequently flooded Wanborough Station which serves the Reading to Gatwick Airport line.

2:- Infrastructure

1. Roads

Normandy is served mainly by two fairly narrow roads, Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane. The railway crosses both.

Westwood Lane has a low railway bridge with a height restriction, which means that it cannot accommodate double decker buses or high sided lorries.

Glaziers Lane crosses the railway by a road bridge which has a bend on its apex. A potentially dangerous condition exists on the south side of Wanborough Station. Station Road joins Glaziers Lane at an acute angle. Large vehicles cannot turn into the Station safely if driving along Glaziers Lane from the A323 direction and cannot turn towards the A323 when leaving the Station. Station Road is a blind turning for vehicles driving along Glaziers Lane towards the Hogs Back. The railway bridge has just been repaired after it started to crack from the weight of heavy vehicles travelling over it.

Glaziers Lane would not be suitable for the large vehicles from the proposed Showman site. There is a Showman site at present on the A323 at Worplesdon. They have not been able to negotiate either Glaziers Lane or Westwood Lane with any of their vehicles. The siting of a showman site on the proposed A46 site would be totally impractical.

A sixty bedded residential home would also create problems of parking. Unless staff and visitors arrived by train the only access to the proposed site would be by car, thus more traffic for our already congested roads.

In order to accommodate the increased traffic which would arise from the number of houses, the residential home and the showman site, Normandy's roads would have to be widened and up-graded.
The A323, Aldershot to Guildford Road. This road is always busy, especially at peak times. If there is an accident on either the A31 Hogs Back or the A3. Traffic congestion is a real problem for Normandy.

School Lane and Hunts Hill are used as a "cut through" from the Hogs Back to get to the A324, Pirbright Road. This is a link to Woking and the A322 which connects with the M3 and Bracknell.

Wyke Primary School is situated in School Lane. The school takes pupils from the surrounding areas of Worplesdon and Ash. This means traffic is particularly heavy in the mornings and afternoons because a lot of parents have to drive their children to school.

Hunts Hill is a narrow unlit lane not suitable for large vehicles as it has steep sides and bends.

Any more traffic would put a severe strain on the existing A323. I used to work at the Royal Surrey County Hospital and on days when the A31 Hogs back is blocked, it has taken me over an hour to drive at 7am in the morning before the "rush hour" has even begun. I think, adding potentially to this scenario could prove catastrophic and even life threatening, unless very major improvements to the existing roads in Normandy.

Most residents of Normandy who do not commute by train to Guildford or Aldershot have to use cars. The very reliable bus service from Guildford to Aldershot travels along the A323. The A46 and A47 sites are both over a mile from the nearest bus stop, making the bus travel option impractical. The 520 bus service which passes near to both these sites only runs three times a day on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday to Guildford and Aldershot. On Wednesday it goes from Aldershot to Woking. This means that this service could not be used for regular commuting.

To get to any shops, particularly supermarkets, it is necessary to use a car. This also applies to getting to the main Doctors Surgery at Fairlands and the Royal Surrey County Hospital.

1. **Trains:** - **Wanborough Station**

South West Trains run a local service from Guildford to Aldershot. However this station is not suitable for the disabled as it only has access to the Aldershot side. To get trains to Guildford the disabled have to go to Ash Station in order to access trains to Guildford.

First Great Western Trains use the line for the Reading to Gatwick Airport trains. The trains do not stop at Wanborough Station, and the service is often disrupted by the station being flooded.

1. **Electricity**

Most of Normandy's electricity supply is by overhead lines. This means the village is subject to frequent power outages in high winds and stormy weather. The power lines are either cut by falling trees or their branches cause an interruption of current. The developments planned would probably have underground cabling on the sites, but that doesn't mean a more reliable electricity supply as most of the village has overhead lines. To upgrade the electricity supply by underground cabling would be a very major and costly project.

Normandy roads are not well lit.

1. **Water supply and sewage**

The water supply is metered and the pressure is fairly reliable.

The sewage system, however, is not so reliable. Most houses in Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane and adjoining roads are on mains sewer. However, after heavy rainfall some houses have been flooded with raw sewage on a regular basis.

The roads are subject to flash floods because road drains are poorly maintained and ditches allowed to be blocked. Wanborough Station is frequently flooded because of the poor maintenance of the road drains and causes major disruption to the rail network.
3:- Amenities

1. School

Wyke Primary School is situated in School Lane. It is a single class entry taking children from Normandy and the surrounding areas from rising five years to eleven years.

All children in year six leaving Wyke School have been accommodated in the existing Secondary Schools in the area. There would seem no need for another secondary School in this area as the local existing secondary schools are under subscribed.

1. Doctors

Normandy is lucky to have a branch surgery and dispensary in Glaziers Lane, the main surgery being on the Fairlands estate. However, it is almost impossible to get appointments without having to wait days, sometimes weeks if a patient wishes to see a particular doctor.

1. Normandy Therapy Garden

This is an award winning facility providing courses for disabled and Special-needs students. It does run a shop where produce grown in the garden is sold, however it is limited by the growing season for its vegetables and fruit and of course the weather.

It is the only shop in the Village

1. c) Manor fruit farm

Normandy has an excellent Village Hall on this site. It has a main Hall with Kitchen, a small hall also with kitchen and a further meeting room on the first floor. Nearly all the village clubs and societies use the hall for their meetings. It is also available for private hire.

The site is also used by the Bowling Club and Archery Club, both have club houses.

1. e) On Normandy common there is a thriving tennis club and a cricket The cricket pitch is unique in that seen from the air it is a complete circle.

4):- Environment

Normandy is a Village situated in the Green Belt. It has ancient woodland and grassland areas within the village boundaries. There is varied fauna and flora found in these areas. Surveys within these habitats have revealed a diverse ecology, many of which are rare animals and plants. To have a large development would not only destroy many species, but do away with vital "green corridors" needed by the animals.

The proposed development A47 is situated on a designated SNCI and has been identified as a Water Vole Alert Area. Great crested newts and several species of dragon flies are found in the ancient Linen Pond. This pond has existed from medieval times when flax was grown in the surrounding area for the production of linen. It is essential this Social historical site be preserved.

Both A46 and A47 sites have populations of hedgehogs, roe and fallow deer, foxes, badgers, water voles, little owls, yellow hammers, sparrow hawks, fieldfares, red kites, slow worms, adders, grass snakes, frogs, toads, great crested newts, as well as many more common species like robin, sparrows, blue-tits, great tits, coal tits, starlings, black birds, collared doves, wood pigeons, house martins and most of the corvid family. The diverse plant life provides habitats for many types of insects, including the endangered stag beetle. Many butterfly and moth species rely on this plant diversity.
Pipistrelle bats are found in both these areas and can be seen in the gardens of Glaziers Lane regularly during the summer evenings.

Normandy Common and Normandy Pond are designated as SNCl areas.

Normandy’s flora is also very diverse and includes many species of orchid, especially the common spotted orchid. Much of the flora found in Normandy, particularly in the two areas A46 and A47 earmarked for large scale development, are plants which need marshy or damp conditions, this, I hope, illustrates the point that geologically, Normandy is not an ideal place for major development as it would exacerbate the problem of further flooding. There are more than fifty different wild flowers and plants found in Normandy. Insects, birds and bees need these plants. If they were to disappear not only would Normandy lose many of its wild plants and trees, but whole species of wild fauna which depend on them.

It would be a "Nature Disaster Area" to lose our fauna and flora.

The present population of Normandy at the 2011 census is 2981. The historical definition of a village is "a collection of houses and associated buildings, larger than a hamlet and smaller than a town situated in a RURAL area". The proposed large scale developments would probably more than double the population and mean Normandy ceases to be a village and become a commuter suburb of Guildford and so lose its identity.

It has been proved by many studies by psychologists, environmentalists and many of the medical profession that green areas are important for our good health and well-being.

I hope our arguments opposing large scale development within the boundaries of Normandy will be considered by the planning Committee. We are proud to be a village, but any large scale development would have repercussions to the ecology and ambience of Normandy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
this proposal without assessing adequately beforehand how it would fit the policies that relate to the open countryside of the Green Belt.

CPRE has attended two packed public meetings since then at which the Guildford Borough and Surrey County Councillors spoke. At one meeting the local MP was also present. It appears that the whole community was totally taken by surprise at this proposed encroachment onto Green Belt countryside for which as residents they had received no advance warning.

CPRE has enjoyed good communication with the former Chair of the Parish Council and with members of the Normandy Action Group (NAG) over many years. We also have regular contact with the local Councillors concerned.

CPRE has established an additional link to the Friends of Normandy Wildlife since the draft Local Plan was published and have as a result become familiar with the issues which most concern them regarding biodiversity and ecology. We have also visited the proposed development area which is largely made up of Grade 3 agricultural land and some stretches of ancient woodland.

We have subsequently studied the submission that they have made which we consider thorough and professional. We have every confidence that the information in their submission can be considered as an accurate statement as to the current situation with regard to wildlife of all kinds in Normandy and Flexford.

The Treasurer of the Friends of Normandy Wildlife has also made a submission as an individual resident who is a member of CPRE which we have studied and fully endorse. CPRE agrees wholeheartedly with the views she has expressed which we consider accurately indicate that the proposal is unsound on the grounds listed later in this part of our submission.

1. ISSUES RELATING TO STRATEGY

The massive scale of this proposed development of 1,100 houses is unacceptable and inappropriate as it will encroach on the permanence of the Green Belt and damage the openness of the rural environment at this location by the introduction of high density urban sprawl. The Minister has made clear that housing demand is not sufficient grounds for altering the Green Belt boundary and therefore cannot be considered as “exceptional circumstances” justifying change in this context in the draft local plan. CPRE OBJECTION.

The site is overlooked from the South by the Hogs Back ridge which is located in the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and is also an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV). The Surrey Hills Management Plan to which GBC is a signatory in Policy LU2 that “Development will respect the special landscape character of the locality, giving particular attention to potential impacts on ridgelines, public views, tranquillity and light pollution.” Policy LU5 states that “development that would spoil the setting of the AONB, by harming public views into or from the AONB, will be resisted.” Natural England are to undertake a boundary review of the AONB at the Hogs Back to evaluate whether adjacent countryside can be rated as equivalent in quality to the AONB and therefore of national importance. This long standing strategy to which GBC has agreed should be observed and not obstructed.
Westwood (C16) and Glaziers (D60) Lanes which will provide access to the site are the rural roads which enclose the proposed development area with the A323 and the railway line. The railway bridge on Westwood Lane reduces traffic flow to a single track. This infrastructure will in our view not be able to cope with the additional traffic which the proposed new development will cause. The draft Local Plan indicates that local highway environmental improvements (which are not specified) would mitigate the transport impact from the development, a statement which we find difficult to believe. However, the Strategic Highway Assessment Report carried out by Surrey County Council on behalf of GBC concludes that the Aldershot Road (A323) which already has little or no spare room for more vehicles at peak times would experience increased traffic congestion. Safety considerations from road accident history do not appear to have been taken into account. Because of development in the Aldershot area in Rushmoor, with more planned for the future, the A323 has had to take steadily increasing traffic as vehicles seek to find a way through to Guildford and the A3. There appears to be no joined-up thinking as to the impact of the proposed Normandy/Flexford development on this deteriorating situation. Proposals regarding more passenger use of the unmanned Wanborough station are over optimistic since passengers wishing to reach London have to change at Guildford. The station can only accommodate a maximum train length of 4 carriages. Access to adequate parking at the station is not at present available.

The sewerage system appears to be already running at capacity and could not cope with the proposed development. Footnote 9 for NPPF policy 14 indicates that development in locations at risk of flooding such as at Normandy/Flexford should be restricted.

The community is not convinced that there is a demand for a secondary school in this part of Guildford. An analysis of vacancies at schools in the Hogs Back area indicates that there is current spare capacity. There appears to be a strategy being promoted in the development sector that building a school in this and other development areas will enable a boundary review to be agreed for the Green Belt on the grounds of “exceptional circumstances”. CPRE rejects this idea which it finds fundamentally unsound. CPRE OBJECTION.

The proposal does not clarify which comes first: the extra housing, the new school, the shops, or the infrastructure. It is a chicken or egg story. It appears that GBC has agreed to remove the Normandy/Flexford proposal from the draft local plan should it be shown that the school is not required. CPRE maintains that this development proposal should not have been submitted in the first place and is in conflict with GBC strategy in many areas. It should be removed from the draft Local Plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3821  **Respondent:** 8609473 / Darren Williams  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I am also extremely concerned about site Allocation 46 (Land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford).

First of all, removing villages from the greenbelt is not a sustainable model for house building because the purpose of the greenbelt is to prevent this urban sprawl which you are proposing. You appear to be changing the rules to suit.
I am sure that you have compiled the local plan on projections for housing requirements based on past trends and data, however, something major has since happened in this country and we will shortly be leaving the EU and as such the uncontrolled movement of people from within the EU will no longer apply to our country. Therefore, any data or modelling you previously carried out cannot be used to project future trends so I think the validity of the local plan is in doubt.

On a practical point, the infrastructure in this area is just not sufficient to cope with such a development. I do not see how any of the roads in Flexford could be improved to cope with such a vast number of additional vehicles; life would just be a misery for current residents and the potential new residents.

I am not aware of any provision for a doctor’s surgery and it is already very difficult to get an appointment at the Fairlands or Glaziers Lane surgery and the last thing we need is extra pressure on an already stretched service.

Overall I am just extremely disappointed with this approach and I feel that no thought has been put into it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6854  Respondent: 8609473 / Darren Williams  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site A46 Land to South of Normandy and North of Flexford: Mixed used Development 1100

- I strongly object to the inclusion of this site within the plan for these reasons:

  In my opinion the classification of the two roads that border site A46, Westward Lane and Glaziers Lane, are ill equipped to service a development of this size and the additional traffic. Westwood Lane reduces to a single lane carriageway underneath the railway bridge and Glaziers Lane, a lower classification road than the former is narrower with residential garden boundaries bordering the carriageway. It would seem that the plan hasn't considered a viable transport strategy to implement a development of this scale. As a resident who commutes daily to Walton-on-Thames, I am aware of the already significant traffic congestion within the village at peak times. These two roads are currently roads used to capacity as alternative routes to/from the A3 and as rat runs to/from the Hogs Back, especially when there is a travel incident in Guildford or on the A3 (which is frequent!).

  If the development is considered based on the village being served by a railway station, then this service would be immediately be over-stretched. To double the size of the village would be to potentially double the amount of people using the transport links. Wanborough is a small station with a short platform. The railway station car park has only 8 spaces and there is no scope to provide more. It is surrounded by houses and a roofing business thus not making it conducive to expansion without further investment of developing the field North of the line. The current car park floods terribly whenever it rains and you need wellington boots to access the platforms. This coupled with the lack of parking spaces already forces commuters to park in Culls Road and The Paddocks, so where would additional users of the station park?

  Normandy already suffers with low water pressure, how will the usage of another 1100 homes help this?

  There is already a significant burden on our Doctors Surgery in Glaziers Lane. You can't currently obtain a bookable appointment for much less than 4 weeks in advance, therefore you are often forced to request an emergency appointment as your healthcare needs become more urgent in this time-frame. I do not see how an increase to the size of the village
can improve this situation. Has there been any provision for further healthcare needs of the proposed additional community?

Historically, the land is agricultural. The Greenbelt is for everyone’s benefit. There are Grade 2 listed properties backing onto this site and surely this is part of our heritage that we should be working to preserve. Guildford Borough Council is keen to showcase its history, however, this should not be exclusively retained in a museum or in the town centre. We should be proud to see it in our villages and secure its place in our future.

The light pollution of the proposed development would affect the view from the Surrey Hills and have a lasting effect on the ecology of Normandy - less than 5 kms from the Thames Heath Basin's Special Protection Area, with many wildlife species that use it, as listed above.

The current plan treats Normandy and Flexford as two separate settlements for the purposes of the greenbelt, however, they are one and the same and gives false suggestion; for which I can only presume is beneficial to planning. I cannot see a logical reason for including this development in the draft plan, only for it to serve the council. Dealing with one developer on a scale such as this would ultimately incur less resource than managing many smaller ones. Is Normandy now to suffer for Guildford Borough Council’s shortcomings for not providing adequate housing previously?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4534  **Respondent:** 8627393 / Worplesdon Parish Council (Gaynor White)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

---

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** (): **Sound?** (): **Legally Compliant?** ()

| A46 | **OBJECT** to the inappropriate size of the development in Normandy. Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane, which are unclassified rural roads, as well as the two railway bridges, are unsuitable to an increase in traffic from such a development. The draft Local Plan indicates that local highway environmental improvements (these are not specified) would mitigate the transport impact from this development. |
| - |  |

However, the Strategic Highway Assessment Report carried out by Surrey County Council, on behalf of GBC concludes that the Aldershot Road (A323) would experience increased traffic congestion and have a level of service indicator which would be at least unstable or where there would be no spare capacity. This implies that far more traffic mitigation would be required. The sewerage system is already running at capacity and could not cope with the proposed development. The parish is not convinced that there is a demand for a secondary school in this part of Guildford

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/4799  Respondent: 8640353 / Julian Cranwell  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We object to policy A46 land to the south of Normandy There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints There is unproven demand for secondary school places in the west wards that is being proposed as "exceptional circumstances" to redraw the Green Belt boundary. There is strong research evidence from SCC Education which proves existing under-utilisation in long term of secondary places in the west of the borough. There is an incorrect calculation of bespoke SANG since only 10 ha are proposed within site but the new population requires 21 ha. This will impact viability if contained in site (65 ha approx) - there is not an additional 10 ha in currently proposed SANG pre-allocated schedule in infrastructure report (Russell Place Farm) There is an incorrect evaluation of contribution of land within and between settlements to Green Belt "openness" - the previous PINS decisions in three appeals asserts "openness". GBC state there is no "openness" yet all land parcels in the site are 'red' sensitivity in GBCS Vol 2 Addendum 1 & 2 and all contribute to the 3 key purposes of the Green Belt. There is a failure to engage with Rushmoor under the duty to co-operate rules in regards of traffic impact from Aldershot Urban Extension (3,800 homes) The increased commuting to Guildford plus new local vehicles (1,375 estimated) will take the A323 to over design capacity and produce perpetual congestion The one railway bridge in Glaziers Lane + 1 railway tunnel in Westwood Lane on North Downs line are restricted (tunnel single lane) with poor geometry and have poor safety records with one fatality in last 15 years and there is no plan in the infrastructure report to widen bridge or replace tunnel (Network Rail) This will lock traffic from new development within site to the north of Flexford. C and D class roads are not designed for volumes indicated in Scenario 5. The flood risk will be significantly increased when land is developed. The site lies on the Hogs Back spring line and the land is natural SuDS. There is a stream running through the site with flood risk 3a. Civil engineering mitigation is unlikely to be effective. The site will introduce 300+ dogs and 250+ cats within 1km of TBHSPA and SANG will not stop increased disturbance and predation on the SPA.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1116  Respondent: 8687041 / Michael Aaronson  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( No ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

I wish to OBJECT in the strongest possible terms to the inclusion of Policy/Site A46 in the Local Plan, on the following grounds:

Site A46 would fill in the whole area between the two settlements of Normandy and Flexford and would completely destroy the nature of our community (it would deliver an increase of 175% in the population over the Plan period). The claim that it would achieve greater sustainability is spurious.

There is no legal basis for claiming that housing is needed to build a school and that this constitutes the “exceptional circumstances” required to remove land from the Green Belt in advance of development.

The need for a 7/8FE secondary school on this site has not been established.

Even if the need for an additional 7/8FE secondary school were established, GBC has not demonstrated why development needs to take place on this sensitive Green Belt site as opposed to other alternative sites around the Borough.
There has been no proper assessment of the impact on the local transport and other infrastructure of such a huge development.

The site is less than 1 km away from the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA), where development should be restricted.

This site was not allocated for development in the previous version of the Local Plan and should not therefore have been included in this one.

I develop these arguments further below:

1. Site A46 would fill in the whole area between the two settlements of Normandy and Flexford and would completely destroy the nature of our community (it would deliver an increase of 175% in the population over the Plan period). The claim that it would achieve greater sustainability is spurious. No evidence has been sought/obtained by GBC to justify the assertion that the designation of Normandy/Flexford as a ‘strategic site’ “achieves greater sustainability for the village”. This is an unsubstantiated statement that is not underpinned by any research. The residents have made their views very clear at two public meetings organised by the Normandy Action Group and subsequently by Normandy Parish Council: they do not want the infilling of the open space between their two settlements under the development proposals for Policy/Site A46.

   Part of the rationale for this proposal was an argument in a ‘Green Belt and Countryside Study’ (GBCS) commissioned by GBC that the openness of the land between Normandy and Flexford did not make a sufficiently “important contribution to the openness of the Green Belt” to warrant its needing to remain in the Green Belt as per the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), para 86. This is complete nonsense. It assumes that these opportunities only present themselves to people who drive cars along the roads, as opposed to those who walk the public footpaths – in this case the one between Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane that traverses one of the most rural landscapes in this part of the Borough, with a rich natural flora and fauna that most certainly does contribute to the openness of the Green Belt as per para 86 of the NPPF. It is also ludicrous to claim that the vista from Westwood Lane – or indeed looking down on the area from the Surrey Hills AONB on the Hog’s Back – would not be adversely affected by the construction of an estate of over 1000 new houses. Unsurprisingly, in the public consultation this proposition was heavily contested by local residents, among the other objections they made to the GBC proposals. However it has simply been ignored by GBC in this latest version of the Plan.

2. Closer examination of the GBCS and the Guildford Borough Settlement Hierarchy reveals that Normandy and Flexford are treated as separate settlements for the purposes of Green Belt ‘sensitivity’ but as one settlement for the purposes of ‘sustainability’. This double standard denies the openness of the 85 hectares of land between the two settlements, and the important contribution it makes to the openness of the Green Belt. The proposed merging of Normandy and Flexford is inconsistent with one of the five purposes of the Green Belt (NPPF para 80), namely, to prevent neighbouring towns from merging with each other. Normandy and Flexford may only be villages, rather than towns, but the spirit of the NPPF is clear, and it has been ignored in this case.

3. There is no legal basis for claiming that housing is needed to build a school and that this constitutes the “exceptional circumstances” required to remove land from the Green Belt in advance of development. In February 2016 the leader of GBC, Councillor Paul Spooner, and other GBC Councillors told a public meeting organised by Normandy Parish Council (NPC) that further work on the GBCS had established that the Normandy/Flexford site was at the highest level of sensitivity in terms of Green Belt protection, thereby giving the impression that it was safe from development. However Cllr Spooner also warned that if a proposal came forward to build a secondary school on the site that would “trump” its Green Belt sensitivity. It subsequently transpired that since at least the summer of 2014 GBC had been in discussions with a major developer, Taylor Wimpey, who had obtained an option on a large part of the site, and was offering to make part of it available for the construction of a 7/8FE secondary school. Cllr Spooner has justified the over-riding of the sensitivity criterion in the following terms:

   “This is because it is considered an enabling development to fund a much needed secondary school in the West of Guildford and also achieves greater sustainability for the village[1].”
1. However, the argument that it is an “enabling development” is circular as the claim that the school is needed rests on the argument for building additional houses on this and other sites, but the houses on this site can only be built if the school is allowed to be built. So it amounts to putting up houses to justify a school that would not be needed if the houses were not built.

2. **The need for a 7/8FE school on this site has not been established.** Responses to FoI requests from Surrey County Council disclose that there is no evidence that a 7/8FE secondary school is needed in the west of the borough. It is predicated on increased housing to be provided as part of the Plan in Ash and the Blackwell Farm site to the west of Guildford, as well as the Normandy/Flexford development. The latter alone would only justify a single form entry school, i.e. an insufficient number to justify a new school and one that could be met by utilising capacity in existing schools (as established by Surrey County Councillor for Normandy Keith Witham’s enquiries of local head teachers).

1. **Even if the need for an additional 7/8FE secondary school were established, GBC has not demonstrated why development needs to take place on this sensitive Green Belt site as opposed to other alternative sites around the Borough.** Other sites have been excluded on the basis that they lie in “sensitive red Green Belt land” (“Secondary Schools Discounted Sites, pp 576-580 of the Plan document); exactly the same consideration applies to this site. In other words I wish to challenge SCC/GBC as to the robustness of the decision-making process that has led them to eliminate other potential sites for a secondary school in West Guildford, and in particular I would ask why the one in Normandy suddenly appeared in early 2016 given that SCC’s ‘School Organisation Plan’ of December 2015 contains no reference to the need for additional places in the west of the borough.

2. **There has been no proper assessment of the impact on the local transport and other infrastructure of such a huge development.** The road network in particular, but also the drainage and sewerage system, are already under severe pressure. The site for the proposed development is bounded by a C road and a D road, both of which include dangerous narrow bridges over and under the railway (one single lane traffic and one a blind summit) and both of which exit onto the A323 at one end and the A31, Hog’s Back, at the other. The A323 itself is, at rush hour, already congested and is identified in GBC’s OGSTAR (Options Growth Scenarios Transport Assessment Report) study as being at full capacity already and the access up Wanborough Hill to the Hog’s Back is also a major bottleneck. It is very hard to see how this fragile transport infrastructure could support the additional 1,650 cars that would accompany the 1100 homes in GBC’s proposal, let alone the massive disruption from construction traffic over a period of years that such an enormous building project would entail.

3. **The site is less than 1 km away from the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA), where development should be restricted.** GBC has failed to take into account that the specific policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (para 14, especially footnote 9, and para 119 – with reference to the Birds and Habitats Directives) indicate that a development of this scale, in such proximity to the TBHSPA, should be restricted. In addition development of this scale on this site will cause untold damage to the rich flora and fauna, as detailed by the submission from the Friends of Normandy Wildlife. This summer my garden has seen young foxes, young deer, young Tawny Owls, hedgehogs, bats, and numerous species of bird. Two years ago it was visited by a raptor that on the basis of video footage provided by me led the RSPB to conclude: “So on balance, I think it could be a goshawk, which would be a fantastic sighting in a garden.” This bio-diversity will be irreparably damaged by a development that builds over the precious fields and woodland on the adjacent site, A46.

4. **This site was not allocated for development in the previous version of the Local Plan and should not therefore have been included in this one.** Site A46 has not been the subject of a Regulation 18 consultation. It is an entirely developer-led proposal that is driven by commercial considerations rather than the needs of the local community.

I believe that all these questions reveal fundamental weaknesses in GBC’s “Submission Local Plan” as far as Normandy is concerned. I fail to understand how removing valuable agricultural land and woodland from the Green Belt can be justified by the subjective and erroneous judgments about openness that the GBCS reveals, and how a developer-led proposal to make land available for a school in return for being allowed to build 1100 houses can be consistent with the principles of the NPPF, let alone be legally compliant.

At its Extraordinary Meeting on 24 May, and as a result of representations made by Normandy and Flexford residents to Councillors prior to the meeting, Guildford Borough Council approved the ‘Submission Local Plan’ for public consultation, subject to the following proviso:
As strategic site allocation A46, Land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford, is a land parcel coloured red on the Green Belt sensitivity map and is only included as a strategic site to support the provision of a new secondary school, this strategic site allocation be deleted should it be demonstrated that provision of such a school within this site is not required.”

The Leader of the Council maintained that SCC had before the meeting reaffirmed the need for a school in the west of the Borough, although it transpired that this was purely on the basis of “informal consultations”. FoI requests of SCC[2] (see point 2, above) have disclosed that:

“Without taking into account any additional housing created by the Guildford Local Plan, there are no proposals for a new secondary school in the area west of Guildford, therefore no such considerations have taken place.”

In other words, a new strategic site, A46, which had not featured as such in the Regulation 18 consultation, was included in the Submission Local Plan as a purely developer-led initiative and on the basis of nothing more than informal consultations about the likely future requirement for secondary school places. This is an extraordinarily casual approach to planning and given the damage to the Green Belt that would follow I find it quite shocking that it forms part of the Plan. I repeat my OBJECTION in the strongest possible terms to the inclusion of this site.

[1] In letter of 3 May to constituents from Jonathan Lord MP, attached. In this letter Mr Lord also says he is “appalled and aghast at the proposals” for Normandy contained in the Submission Local Plan.

[2] See attached ‘FoI Responses on Schooling needs from SCC May 2016’.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  

- FoI Responses on schooling needs from SCC May 2016.docx (14 KB)
- Jonathan Lord letter 3 May 16.pdf (804 KB)

Comment ID: pslp172/2657  Respondent: 8687041 / Michael Aaronson  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly support the removal of Policy/Site A46 from the Plan. This was always a purely developer-led proposal that would have permanently destroyed the character of the Normandy/Flexford community. It was "the only site in the 2016 Proposed Submission Plan set to result in the loss of a significant area of ‘red-rated’ Green Belt." (Sustainability Assessment 2017, para 10.11.15) and was strongly opposed by local residents, as was seen in the responses to the 2016 consultation. It was justified by the offer from the developer to provide land for a secondary school, the need for which was never conclusively established. The area makes a significant contribution to the openness of the Green Belt, and its development would have resulted in the coalescence of Normandy and Flexford in contradiction of the declared purposes of the Green Belt. Development on this site would also have involved the loss of Grade 3A agricultural land (Sustainability Assessment para 10.10.7). It would have been a travesty for it to have been included in the Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The proposed development is located in the GREEN BELT outside any identified settlement area and represents inappropriate development which is by definition harmful to the GREEN BELT.

Accordingly to your planning department this proposed site is not in the village of NORMANDY? how ever the site is within 400-Slan THAMES BASIN Heath Special PROTECTION AREA. Why do we need an extra 1100 houses in Normandy anew 1500pupilseconday school, where are all the pupils coming from. You will completely destroy our rural environment of village life, where will all the dogs go for walkies? If you take away our precious GREEN BELT land it will be completely outrageous. To consider doubling our village in a small area is un sustainable pressure on all ready very busy roads.. In Westwood Lane we have a Horse and cart Railway bridge and Glaziers Lane a Railway bridge built in the 1800 both net fit for the 21.st century propose

I strongly OBJECT to this proposal.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/876  Respondent: 8708897 / Richard Cunningham  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( Yes ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- **Statement of objection.**
  - Despite having concerns at the lack of scrutiny by GBC as to how the Objectively Assessed Need figure for the Local Plan has been derived, I acknowledge the need for and support some development throughout the borough.
  - However, **Object** to the large scale ‘strategic’ development proposed at Policy A46 which I consider to be inappropriate. Notwithstanding that I am a resident in Glaziers Lane who would be directly affected by the proposed development; I have tried to remain objective in the points of objection made below.
- **‘Developer led’ policy for site A46.**
  - Cllr Spooner, leader of GBC, stated during his visit to a residents meeting in Normandy on 3 May 16 that the previously proposed ‘safeguarded’ A46 site was to remain ‘red’ in the 2016 Local Plan.
  - This meant that the site was within the Green Belt, was a sensitive area contributing to the openness and permanence of the Green Belt and would therefore not be built upon. This apparently unless a developer proposed building a school on the site. So in other words, this has now become a ‘developer led’ site.
  - I contest that the building of a secondary school is an ‘exceptional circumstance’ enough to bring Normandy out of Green Belt status.
  - The Local Plan should not be 'developer led'.
- **No ‘early and meaningful engagement’ with the local community.**
  - There has been no ‘early and meaningful engagement’ with the residents in Normandy regarding the proposed development at A46. Its appearance in this Local Plan is the first that I have learnt about it. This runs contrary to NPPF 155 which states that this engagement is essential.
  - It is clear that GBC and the developer, Taylor Wimpey, have been in discussion about the site as far back as at least 2014. See attached Taylor Wimpey plan dated September 2014 obtained subsequent to the Local Plan’s publication through a Freedom of Information request. There has been no consultation with residents between 2014 and the issuing of the Local Plan.
  - The proposed development of 1100 homes on site A46 would ‘double’ the size of the village, thereby removing all of Normandy’s current characteristics of community and charm.
I chose to live in Normandy for its openness, rural peacefulness and access to the countryside. I am unconcerned about the lack of food shops or a pub within the village; I accept that facilities such as these thrive or die in a competitive market and with availability through the internet. Although these facilities used to exist in the village market forces have determined otherwise.

Rather than a large proposed development on a single site within an existing community, why does the Local Plan not propose to spread the need for development more equally across the whole borough? This would reduce the significant impact it will have on communities and share development within all parishes.

- **Need for a secondary school in Normandy.**
  - There is no evidence within the Local Plan or supporting documents to suggest that a secondary school is required in Normandy.
  - Surrey County Council has not declared that there is a requirement for such a school in Normandy.
  - With no requirement for a school there is no requirement for 1100 homes.
  - If only 1FE of this new 7FE school is anticipated coming from Normandy (Appendix C - SED3) then the school could also be built elsewhere. This could be at Blackwell Farm which was recommended during the 2014 Local Plan process.
  - Local children from Normandy already travel by train from Wanborough to Guildford for secondary school.

- **Inadequate infrastructure to support proposed development.**
  - General points:
    - There is no evidence that, given the existing national shortage of funding that exists for current infrastructure projects, any of the proposed infrastructure requirements identified in this Local Plan would be met.
    - The Local Plan should state quite categorically that without guaranteed funding for the entire infrastructure plan required to support a development of this scale, the development should be not go ahead.
  - There is no evidence within the Local Plan that the proposed changes to infrastructure would ameliorate a road system in Normandy that is at times already working to capacity (Appendix C - LRN 17, 18 and 19 refer).
  - Glaziers Lane is a busy rural ‘D’ class minor road (D60) with a recognised speeding issue. As well as local traffic, it takes traffic to and from the Hog’s Back via Wanborough Hill. Given the adjacency of housing to the road, there is little opportunity to change the width or direction of the carriageway. The footpath running up the Lane has to change sides in two places. This lane would therefore not contribute to safe, sustainable travel and access to the site given the likely increase in traffic.
  - The bridge over the railway in Glaziers Lane and tunnel under the railway in Westwood Lane are hazardous places at the best of times. The road over the ‘blind’ bridge in Glaziers Lane has an unnerving hump in the road to the south side and the tunnel is single file traffic with a narrow pedestrian walkway. With the increase in traffic that this proposed development would bring, no consideration seems to have been given to improving these bridges for the safety of road users and pedestrians, let alone ease of access to the site.
  - I consider that the proposed development would have a significant impact on the village resulting from commuter vehicle noise, pollution, and congestion and that this has not been recognised. Site traffic during development would exacerbate this situation.
  - Other considerations. I am also concerned that other infrastructure requirements would be looked over at the point of planning application because of a shortage of funding.
    - **Sewerage.** Rainwater run-off already causes significant disruption to residents with sewers backing up into properties and onto roadways. The main sewer pipe in Glaziers Lane is an old six inch diameter pipe and would not be capable of handling the demands from any further development.
    - **Flooding.** The site area, being on a clay based soil, has regularly become either flooded or susceptible to flooding for up to six months of the year. I am concerned that despite with the best intention of including a SuDS (Appendix C - FRR5) on site that this would not be effective enough for the whole site and that locally there would be areas of increased flooding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Land bounded by Aldershot/Guildford Railway, Glaziers Lane, A323 & Westwood Lane.

I supported and commented in detail to the 2013 Local Plan -Ref my letter 26-11-13.

When the 2014 proposed plan was issued all had changed and suddenly Green Belt Land had become safeguarded. I opposed these significant proposed changes. -Ref my Letter 18-9-14.

Now we are presented with the proposed Draft Local Plan 2016. Having considered in detail the impact this will have on our rural area of Normandy/Plextord I am strongly opposed to this Plan on the following points.

1 -Green Belt Land The Borough conveniently refers this area as "safeguarded" but fails to demonstrate "exceptional circumstances" to transfer this area from Green Belt Land. For our rural area of Normandy this must stay as Green Belt land.

2 -National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

This provides local residents an opportunity to be involved with the proposed redevelopment of their home environment. No involvement was available to residents until this plan was released. For me this appears to be Developer (ie Taylor Wimpey) led with proposals to build Schools, Care Homes, Shops etc in order to get Planning Permission for large scale profitable development!

3 -School

This is "Chicken & Egg" -build the houses you will need a new secondary school! However there seems no justification for a new school as the two nearest secondary schools Ash Manor and Kings College Guildford are under subscribed. Kings College have stated that if there were Increased needs they would be prepared to expand!

4 -Infrastructure

The Village Is already heavily congested with through traffic due to the density of transport along the A31 Hogs Back and A 323 Aldershot to Guildford commuter flow. Development of the scale proposed will completely grid-lock the Village especially with school collections! The railway bridges In Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane would make road redevelopment hugely expensive.

5 -Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (TBHSPA)

The A46 site is in the zone of protection and if developed would Impact seriously on the five key threats to the Area.

6 -Scale of Proposed Development

I accept that more affordable housing is urgently needed and I supported the 2013 Proposed Local Plan to achieve this objective. local Plan 2014 was targeted principally to the West of Guildford with 53% of new housing for the next 10 years in this area which for me was unacceptable. Now with 2016 Local plan it will totally change a pleasant rural Village Into an unacceptable urban congestion!
1000 plus properties in a highly congested area subjected to flooding is not right for this rural area. The Proposal includes retail properties, again I suspect the Developers' suggestion. We have had shops in the village when we first moved to Normandy 55 years ago but they could not survive against the Supermarket's range and sadly I expect the same would happen again!

I was very surprised the Borough proposing to mix Traveller Pitches within Residential housing. With two different cultures there is potential for conflict!

7 - Environmental Issues

The urban spread West of Guildford and East of Aldershot is destroying much of our important rural habitat and in turn much of our native wildlife. We must protect the valuable areas that remain.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6238  Respondent: 8727457 / Nuala Crampin  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land South of Normandy and North of Flexford

This proposed development will completely destroy the semi-rural character of Normandy; again there is not the road infrastructure to support it and the A323 and Wood Street Village will be adversely affected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4450  Respondent: 8728161 / Judy Kennedy  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the release of Site A46 from the Green Belt and the proposed development in Normandy for the following reasons:

Road/highway infrastructure. There has been no demonstrable evidence of any forward planning to increase and develop the highway accessibility which would be required for a housing development of 1100 new homes/traveller sites/secondary school. At least 1500 additional cars using minor local roads would be a conservative estimate. Unless there is an immediate plan to widen the A31/A3/A323 and build a bridge/tunnel to relieve the Ash railway crossing, any proposals for this housing development are ill-thought out, foolhardy and unplanned.

Secondary school provision under 'exceptional circumstances' for development. In-depth research and studies show that the two secondary schools in the Normandy catchment area: King's College and Ash Manor are approximately 40% under subscribed and likely to continue to be so. I object that one of the main premises for the proposed development is based on flawed statistics for additional secondary school places, when the existing schools are struggling to fill pupil numbers.
Travellers' sites proposed within the development. I object that Normandy is once again required to provide further sites for travellers. Normandy has its quota of these sites and it is time for a fairer distribution within the Borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7617  **Respondent:** 8728865 / Neville Bryan  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Object

A development of this size is inappropriate for Normandy. Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane, which are unclassified rural roads, as well as the two railway bridges, are unsuitable for an increase in traffic from such a development. The draft Local Plan indicates that local highway environmental improvements (these are not specified) would mitigate the transport impact from this development...

However, the Strategic Highway Assessment Report carried out by Surrey County Council, on behalf of GBC concludes that the Aldershot Road (A323) would experience increased traffic congestion and have a level of service indicator which would be at least unstable or where there would be no spare capacity. This implies that far more traffic mitigation would be required.

The sewerage system is already running at capacity and could not cope with the proposed development. We are not convinced that there is a demand for a secondary school in this part of Guildford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1213  **Respondent:** 8729313 / Lisa Wright  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

This site was previously safeguarded for future development. The villagers were promised that this site would not come forward for another 15 years, essentially they were lied to!

No consultation with Rushmoor Council ref traffic.

OBJECT, Site is Greenbelt and should be protected.

OBJECT, There are no proven special circumstances to bring this site forward.

OBJECT, sensitive wildlife site.

OBJECT, Road network cannot cope with current traffic. Both Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane have severe restrictions.
OBJECT, Impact of Traffic on Aldershot Road.

OBJECT, not enough trains to take people to Guildford or London.

OBJECT, this iste floods and Normandy already has issues with sewerage flooding when it rains heavy.

OBJECT, Impact on local doctors and primary school capacity.

OBJECT, Urban sprawl, joining of 4 small hamlets into a very large village.

OBJECT, air and traffic pollution.

OBJECT, Impact on Ancient Woodland.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1215  Respondent: 8729313 / Lisa Wright  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

OBJECT, No special circumstances exist to warrant building this site. No secondary school is required in the West of Guildford. Please see SCC data .

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4047  Respondent: 8731361 / Caroline Robertson  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I support the removal of sites A46 and A47 from the 2017 Plan, which were strongly opposed by Councillors and other Normandy residents due to the fact that they would have significantly and irretrievably destroyed the character of Normandy and Flexford. Additionally, a significant burden would have been placed on the local transport and other infrastructure.

I am pleased that Guildford Borough Council (GBC) have taken note of the many objections to these proposed sites and also of the findings of the revised Sustainability Appraisal 2017 and removed them from the Plan.

With regard to A47, as the reason for this amendment highlighted in the summary of key changes to the Proposed Submission Local Plan, ‘the site continues to meet the criteria for a Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI), which is incompatible with development.’
I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.

With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become even more biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I wish to strongly object to site A46 Flexford/Normandy

This proposed development would cause traffic chaos. Westwood lane and Glaziers lane are small country roads. I live right next to the railway bridge in Westwood lane and already have to dice with death pulling out blind into fast oncoming traffic.

The additional vehicles 1100 houses, a school, shops and visitors will bring Will cause a traffic funnel where the road is single lane under the bridge and residents accessing from beach lane will never get out without the increased chance of a lethal accident. To say that nothing will come this way from the north of the village is ridiculous. I understand that Surrey county councils own traffic simulations show that even present levels of traffic are above the capacity our roads were designed for.

The small Doctors surgery is straining under existing levels of need. Waiting times for appointments now are 3 weeks so this defiantly can't support 4 or 5 thousand more patients

This development will exasperate the drain problem which the council know from the previous development in Beach lane planning process.

Building this development will deprive us of land that drains away rain water that the present sewer system can't cope with all ready resulting in flooding.

My bungalow's s drains back up in bad weather making it impossible to use the loo or washing machine till it subsides, documented by Thames water. This development cannot join the mains drains without devastating effects.
I understand the need for housing and small pockets were expected over the borough but this large proposal on green belt land is not acceptable or sustainable. It wasn't in the 2014 plan in fact it was positively disregarded. What changed? Other options need exploring.

There is a proposal for a development not in the local plan which should be considered at land off Epsom road west Horsley adjacent to the A246.

This land is surrounded by existing development, on a strategic highway route, is low quality green belt land, visually self-contained all of which Normandy is not.

The development is being "sold" by the developers if they build a school as a bribe.

This development is developer driven and not local need driven and needs reassessing after the discussion to leave the EU as demand will fall for housing in light if future reduced immigration.

This school is not required as plenty of capacity locally exists as proven by Surrey county councillor Keith Witham so build it where it is required.

You cannot believe the proposals will not change the character, structure, nature wildlife, and openness separating the village.

This green belt land separates different parts of the village and stops urban sprawl making it a town.

None of the village wants or needs such a large development. We don't want a park barn 2.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/931  Respondent: 8747969 / Alan Burchett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---

STRATEGIC SITE A46 – NORMANDY/FLEXFORD

1. **MAIN OBJECTION**

I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to Strategic Site A46 (Normandy/Flexford) being taken out of the Green Belt in order to build 1,100 homes, together with a Secondary School and other facilities. This site was not one of the seven sites that were included in the Pegasus Planning Group’s ‘Green Belt and Countryside Study’ as a specified location for development. I understand that these other sites are still in the evidence base and I believe that they should now be reconsidered, in place of strategic site A46.

It appears that the developer, Taylor Wimpey, may have funded the reviews of flooding, drainage, ecology, landscape, transport and community infrastructure on this site and, if this is so, this clearly lacks any objectivity, which should not be allowed. The developer claims that this scheme for the land at Normandy provides the opportunity to create a more sustainable neighbourhood for the existing village as well as the new residents of the proposed development and yet I do not believe that these arguments will stand up to scrutiny without the empirical evidence from the ‘Green Belt and Countryside Study’. Also, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that there should be early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods regarding the needs and priorities of the village. This has not happened in spite of the fact that at least two years ago the developer submitted documentation to Guildford Borough Council (GBC) regarding this site. The only ‘early and meaningful engagement and collaboration’ seems to have been between the developer and the Council. This surely is in breach of the NPPF.

The argument that this is an “enabling development” is circular as the claim that the school is needed rests on the argument for building additional houses on this and other sites. But the houses on this site can only be built if the school
is allowed to be built. So it amounts to putting up houses to justify a school that would not be needed if the houses were not built. This becomes a circular argument and therefore the justification for development is considerably weakened. In any case, in the draft Plan, the need for the school is said to arise from the housing allocation, but GBC has not justified the development of the housing by reference to any “exceptional circumstances”.

My other reasons for objecting are related to the road network around the site, the inclusion of a school, sustainability & sensitivity, the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, infrastructure issues and the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area, as described below

1. **THE ROAD NETWORK**

The road network in Normandy will not be able to sustain the volume of traffic that a development with 1,100 homes would create and there are no highway improvements that can conceivably be made to these country lanes to convert them to the A-class roads needed to serve such a development. The proposed site is boxed in by an unclassified road (Glaziers Lane D60) on the east, a C-class road (Westwood Lane C16) on the west, a railway line to the south and the A323 to the north. Both Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane struggle to cope with the existing volume of traffic, let alone the increased traffic from an 1,100 home development and road traffic to and from the proposed school. There is a narrow humpback bridge on Glaziers Lane to negotiate, which is on a deceptive double bend and has very limited sight lines, as well as a right angled bend where the Lane meets another unclassified road, Flexford Lane. There is also an extremely dangerous, single-lane chicane under a railway bridge on Westwood Lane which also has a deceptive double bend and a height limit of 14’-3” under which a double-decker bus is not able to pass. There are also dangerous junctions where these roads meet the A323 Guildford to Aldershot road at their northern ends. At rush hour this road is already congested and is identified in GBC’s ‘Options Growth Scenario Transport Assessment Report’ as being at full capacity already. The entry and exit from the A31 ‘Hogs Back’ on to the B3000 to travel to and from the development site via Wanborough Hill is a ‘bottle neck’ at most times of the day, and would be likely to ‘grid lock’ with the increased volume of traffic to and from the site and the school. No amount of improvements to the road system will enable these rural roads to cope with the increased volume of traffic, let alone the construction traffic that would disrupt this fragile infrastructure over possibly a fifteen year period. The ‘Infrastructure Schedule’ shows that just £2.8m has been earmarked to improve these dangerous junctions through developer contributions, but this amount would be totally inadequate.

**Glaziers Lane**

Glaziers Lane is an unclassified road (D60) and is unsuitable for the volume of traffic that the proposed development would generate together with additional traffic going to and from the school. The Lane is a rural, residential road, just 6 metres wide at the widest point, with a 30mph speed limit throughout its length. The Lane is a busy commuter route for cars, commercial vehicles, lorries, multi-axle heavy goods vehicles and articulated lorries cutting through between the A323 Guildford to Aldershot Road and the A3 and A31. Many of these vehicles fail to adhere to the speed limit. To my knowledge there have been two fatal road traffic accidents in the Lane.

Parked vehicles are mostly parked on the pavement owing to the narrowness of the rural Lane. This means that pedestrians, those in wheelchairs and parents/carers with pushchairs or prams, have to walk in the road and are at risk from passing vehicles. There is a nursery school close to the potential vehicular access point in Glaziers Lane shown on the developer’s concept masterplan, and at drop off and pick up times of the day parents’ parked cars reduce the Lane to a single track, with the added dangers of young children being taken from and secured into the vehicles.

The street lighting in Glaziers Lane is poor and could at best be described as footpath lighting. Towards the southern end of the Lane is a humpback road bridge over the railway line, which has a sharp incline and decline so that on approach there is no view of the other side of the bridge. The bridge is also on a slight, but deceptive, double bend in the road. At this point the Lane narrows to 5.5 metres, slightly under in places. This is an especially dangerous part of the Lane as cars speed towards the bridge from both directions, with no view of the other side. The roadway of the bridge is badly sunken on both sides due to the weight of the heavy goods vehicles crossing the bridge. This bridge would be hazardous for cyclists travelling to and from the school and, because of the narrowness of the bridge, no dedicated cycle lane could be installed. At the northern end of the Lane is the junction with the A323 Guildford to Aldershot Road, where Glaziers Lane crosses over to Hunts Hill Road. This is a difficult junction to negotiate owing to the amount of traffic travelling along the main road, and also because there are cars turning right out of Glaziers Lane on to the main road, cutting across
the path of cars coming across from Hunts Hill Road, with both sets of drivers attempting to find a gap in the main road
traffic. There is often a tail-back of traffic in Glaziers Lane waiting to exit.

The single footpath along the Lane is not continuous, changing from side to side of the road along its length. This means
that pedestrians have to cross the road at various points in order to remain on the footpath, with two exceptionally
dangerous crossing points which are poorly maintained by Surrey County Council (SCC). One is by the stream just south
of no. 35 Glaziers Lane, on a sharp bend, which means that pedestrians have a poor view of vehicles approaching in both
directions along the Lane, and drivers of these vehicles cannot clearly see the pedestrians until the last moment. The other
dangerous crossing point is on the north of the road bridge that crosses the railway line, as vehicles approaching from the
south only have a short stopping distance after crossing the summit of the ‘blind’ bridge before arriving at the crossing
point. These crossing points are especially dangerous for those in wheelchairs, the elderly and infirm, and parents/carers
with pushchairs or prams, who require more time to cross the road. At some points the footpath is reduced to a width of
much less than a metre, due to the outward growth of hedges meaning that passing pedestrians often have to walk in the
road. A build-up of debris where the kerbs are lowered at the crossing points also means that pedestrians have to move on
to the road to avoid the mud.

The railway station is situated close to the southern side of the humpback bridge and has a limited car park, which
regularly floods, and which will be insufficient for the anticipated increase in vehicle numbers. Cars parked instead on
Glaziers Lane would add to the hazards that already exist. Traffic exiting the station car park and turning north has a tight
turning circle in order to keep on the correct side of the road and is vulnerable to vehicles speeding over the bridge south-
bound with limited views of the approaching traffic. The increased volume of cars using the station car park would add
considerably to the dangers.

Westwood Lane

Westwood Lane is classified as a C Class road (C16) and is unsuitable for the volume of traffic that the proposed
development would generate as well as additional traffic going to and from the school. The Lane is a rural, residential
road, with a 30mph speed limit along the southern residential part of the road up to the railway bridge, and a 40mph limit
up to the northern end of the road along which there are no street lights. The Lane is a busy commuter route for cars,
commercial vehicles, lorries, multi-axle heavy goods vehicles and articulated lorries travelling between the A323
Guildford to Aldershot Road and the A3 and A31. Many of these vehicles fail to adhere to the speed limits. The street
lighting is poor and there is no street lighting on the long 40mph stretch of the road. There is a hill from Flexford Road
(an unclassified road), at the southern end of Westwood Lane, to the railway bridge down which vehicles speed.

The road under the railway bridge is a single track chicane on a deceptive double bend, with priority given to vehicles
travelling south. There has already been one fatality at this bridge and many accidents. There is a 14’ 3” height
restriction on the bridge which means that a double decker bus would not be able to pass under (which would
considerably restrict transporting pupils to and from the school). Immediately on the southern side of the bridge travelling
north, on the nearside, is a road exit at Beech Lane. Vehicles turning left under the bridge travelling north cannot be seen
by vehicles that have priority travelling south, and a greater volume of traffic will only increase the inherent dangers at
this bridge. This bridge would be hazardous for cyclists travelling to and from the school, and a major congestion point
for the increased traffic that an 1,100 housing development would bring.

At the northern end of the Lane is the junction with the A323 Guildford to Aldershot. This is an extremely dangerous
junction with traffic from Westwood Lane attempting to turn both ways onto the busy A323, while traffic from the A323
is attempting to turn into Westwood Lane. There was a recent fatality very close to the junction with Westwood Lane.
This junction is already a ‘bottle neck’ at busy times of the day. There is the added danger that only a few yards to the
west is School Lane, along which Wyke Primary school is located. There is a nearby crossing point ‘island’ on the A323
which is hazardous for pupils and their parent to use and cars have already mounted this island demolishing the street
sign. Many parents who drop off and meet their children park alongside the churchyard in Westwood Lane and negotiate
this busy crossing point ‘island’ to get to School Lane. This crossing point will become even more dangerous if an
additional form of entry is added to the school, and there is increased traffic entering and exiting Westwood Lane to and
from the 1,100 home development, and the secondary school.
The footpath is on both sides of Westwood Lane as far north as the railway bridge but from there to the northern end of the road there is a narrow path only on the east side, totally inadequate for the number of pupils at an 8FE secondary school to safely use.

B3000 entry/exit to the A31 and Wanborough Hill

The entry and exit from the A31 ‘Hogs Back’ on to the B3000 to travel to and from the development site via Wanborough Hill (C16) is a ‘bottle neck’ at most times of the day, and would be likely to ‘grid lock’ with the increased volume of traffic to and from the proposed development site and the school. There is no pavement nor street lighting from Wanborough Hill until the road reaches Normandy.

Because of the above points, I believe that the poor road infrastructure bordering the strategic site and beyond does not make it a suitable location for 1,100 homes, a secondary school, and the other planned facilities, and so I wish to object to the proposal on the grounds given.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: LOCAL PLAN OBJECTION from Mr A J Burchett.docx

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8294  Respondent: 8747969 / Alan Burchett  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

STRATEGIC SITE A46 – NORMANDY/FLEXFORD

1. SECONDARY SCHOOL

There is no justification for a new secondary school in Normandy and I would question the decision-making process that has led GBC to eliminate other potential sites for a secondary school in West Guildford, for example the site at Roker’s Farm. The proposed school did not even feature in the 2014 version of the Local Plan but suddenly appeared in early 2016. This is strange given that SCC’s ‘School Organisation Plan’ of December 2015 contains no reference to the need for additional school places in the west of the Borough. It appears that the only reason that this school is proposed in Normandy is because the developer has managed to obtain an option on most of the land in question and has proposed to the Council that, in return for being allowed to build 1,100 homes, it will provide the serviced land to allow the Council to put a secondary school on the site. The inclusion of a secondary school on this site is merely a ‘Trojan horse’ provided by the developer to have this site taken out of the Green Belt. The Leader of GBC has stated publicly that the inclusion of a school on this site “trumps” any Green Belt protection, allowing a school to be built on this sensitive red Green Belt land but I cannot find any evidence that this is the case.

There appear to be double standards in use by GBC when deciding on the most appropriate site for a school and it seems that they are manipulating the criteria to suit the desired outcome. In the document “Secondary Schools Borough Wide Discounted Sites”, the site to the east of the Borough at Howard of Effingham is described as "zoned as ‘sensitive’ red Green Belt land and there are therefore preferable sites to this on which to accommodate future school needs." It is perverse that in the document there is no mention of site A46 being ‘sensitive red Green Belt land’, which the Leader of the Council has declared it to be, but is instead found to be suitable because of the number of houses that can be built there and the fact that it has a station. It appears that there is no desire on the part of GBC to find more preferable sites for the secondary school in relation to site A46, because it suits their need to have a school on the site to justify the housing.

It is inconceivable that a decision would be taken to place a school anywhere without serious consideration being given to the most suitable location, and a location that is supported by a safe road network. However, in conversation with the School Commissioning Officer for SCC it is clear that only “informal discussions” have taken place between SCC and the developer with regard to this being a suitable site. Just as worrying, through a Freedom of Information (FOI) request,
SCC has stated that they “have not undertaken any specific research on … the ability of local roads to cope with traffic that may be associated with a new school”.

In its official response to GBC in July 2014 to the previous draft Local Plan, SCC said, “A site within the proposed urban extension at Blackwell Farm, with all necessary access infrastructure built in and a catchment surrounding the site, would be a more sustainable location in transport terms for a new secondary school to serve the western side of Guildford.” It is concerning that GBC has not heeded this advice.

GBC has to show that the provision of a school constitutes the “exceptional circumstances” that are required to redraw the boundary on this sensitive Green Belt site, thus removing the site from the Green Belt in advance of development. As is shown on the following pages there has been no serious pre-planning by GBC nor SCC (as the Commissioner for school places), to establish:

- the actual need for a new Secondary school to the west of Guildford
- if this is the most preferable site for a secondary school
- what the Published Admission Number (PAN) should be so that the intake can be established
- whether existing schools can be enlarged or the PAN of these schools increased
- whether the funding to build the school would be forthcoming from the Department for Education (DfE)
- if sponsors or proposers can be found for the school
- whether the road infrastructure can support a new school and is safe to do so
- whether there is the infrastructure to allow pupils to cycle or walk to the school safely from sites to the east and west

The FOI responses have basically stated that this will all be looked at as part of the planning application process. Therefore there is a presumption that the Local Plan will be accepted with a school on this site and that matters will proceed naturally as part of the planning process. So, if it is decided that there are insufficient reasons to place a school on site A46, the land will have been removed from the Green Belt without any justification whatsoever, allowing developers to build houses on what should have remained a Green Belt site.

Therefore I do not believe that the “exceptional circumstances” have been shown and certainly the ‘Sustainability Appraisal’ of the draft Plan does not explain any exceptional circumstance justifying release from the Green Belt. The only circumstance that has been exposed is that the developer wishes to make a huge profit with this ‘Trojan horse’ of a school. It is of great detrimental effect to the village to lose its Green Belt, but of enormous financial benefit to the developer.

Appendix C of the Local Plan, Infrastructure Schedule SED3, states the need for, “A 7-form entry (7FE) secondary school at the Normandy / Flexford strategic development site. Only 1 FE would be needed to serve the strategic development site itself, the remaining capacity would serve the wider area, including Blackwell Farm strategic site.”

It is clear, therefore, that there is no need for a secondary school simply to serve the proposed housing on this site, as a 1FE school would not be viable.

To support this, a FOI request to SCC (as the Commissioner of school places) shows that, without the demand created by the housing development, a new school is not needed.

SCC was asked:

What considerations have taken place with regard specifically to the need for a new secondary school in the area west of Guildford, taking into account projected housing completions but not taking into account any additional housing created by the Guildford Local Plan.

SCC responded:

“Without taking into account any additional housing created by the Guildford Local Plan, there are no proposals for a new secondary school in the area west of Guildford, therefore no such considerations have taken place.”
The GBC Local Plan: Strategy & Sites 2016 – Part 2: Sites, states that the site will include a secondary school up to 8 form entry. Yet when a FOI request was made to SCC:

What is the published admission number (PAN) of the proposed new school in Normandy, their response was:

“It is too early to define the admission number of the proposed school in Normandy. This would be largely dependent on the number of housing developments progressed for which a new school may serve, taking into consideration any capacity in existing schools closer to the time when the places are needed. The provisional size is up to 7FE in order to ensure sufficient provision is considered in line with possible housing.”

The GBC Local Plan: Strategy & Sites 2016 – Part 2: Sites, also states that “Secondary educational needs will be reassessed at the time a planning application is made at which time any recent new secondary school provision will be taken into account.”

These responses clearly show that SCC has no idea of the number of pupils that will require a place at the school, nor if existing schools could accommodate the pupils instead of building a new school. If fewer developments are progressed than expected the PAN of the school may well fall below 150, which SCC has stated is the minimum number required to make a school viable. Therefore it does not make sense to progress with a school if there is a possibility that there will be insufficient pupils to make the school viable. The land will be removed prematurely from the Green Belt without any assurance that the school will ever be built.

Given the poor road links to and from the development site, it would be dangerous to transport in a further possible 840 children a day, with all the inherent dangers at drop off and pick up time. Alternatives should be looked at, such as enlarging Ash Manor school, or others, to take this 1FE (30 children), which would be a much cheaper option. The possibility of enlarging other secondary schools in Guildford should also be looked at as an alternative, as none of these schools is anywhere near approaching the PAN of 360 pupils, which the SCC School Organisation Plan states is the maximum in order to be viable. The overall PAN for all 7 secondary schools is only 1426, or an average of 204 (or 211 taking into account the proposed increased numbers at St Peter’s and Guildford County), whereas the School Organisation Plan states that the viable number is between 150 and 360. Alternatively, GBC should seek another site for the school that has safe transport links and does not destroy this sensitive red Green Belt site. Or approaches should be sought from Academies or Free Schools to sponsor new secondary school/schools in the Guildford borough. The ‘New Schools Network’ states, “Free schools are expected to open in existing buildings and it is unlikely that the Department for Education will allow schools to open in new buildings”, which is what is anticipated with the school on this site.

The expansion of existing schools would better keep pace with the demand from new housing, and also take account of the declining birth rate which has already been noted. If this development did take place, unless the school was built first, or in stages, children would have to go to a secondary school somewhere else, and this would reduce the PAN below what is viable (SCC has stated that this development would yield 157 pupils a year and that the minimum PAN needed to make a school viable is 150). Building a school in stages over a number of years is not practical as facilities such as PE, Science, Technology, Art etc. will be needed from day 1, as well as general teaching spaces, playgrounds, sports pitches etc. The idea of the concept masterplan is fine, but it shows the actual completed development, with the children from all the houses attending their local secondary school, and this may not be reality until 2033. It is especially concerning that in Appendix C, the Infrastructure Study, there is no delivery date against the completion of the school, which indicates that this school may not be constructed until after the housing is built. The developer will want to make as much profit as possible from the housing, before constructing the school. In the meantime the children of secondary school age will have been placed in secondary schools elsewhere, and the school will not be needed. If the school is not needed the Green Belt must be protected.

From responses to FOI requests (see below) it is clear that there has been no serious attempt by GBC nor SCC (as the Commissioner of school places), to establish the need for a new Secondary school to the west of Guildford, nor to ascertain whether the funding to build the school would be forthcoming from the DfE. To include a proposal in the Local Plan that seeks to justify building 1,100 houses in the Green Belt on the back of an unsubstantiated need for a school, rather than on an objective analysis, seems highly irresponsible. The land would be removed from the Green Belt without any assurance that the school would ever be built.
The Leader of GBC maintained that, before the Extraordinary Meeting of the Council on 24 May 2016, SCC had reaffirmed the need for a school in the west of Guildford, although it transpired that this was purely on the basis of “informal discussions”. These informal discussions were confirmed in a conversation I had with the School Commissioning Officer. In other words, a new strategic site, A46, which had not featured as such in the previous consultation, was included in the Submission Local Plan on the basis of nothing more than informal consultations about the likely future requirements for secondary school places. This hardly constitutes the serious decision making that would be expected to define the “exceptional circumstances” that are required to redraw the boundary on this sensitive Green Belt site.

Additional information relating to the secondary school

Ref. the document: “DfE Guidance for decision-makers”

Statutory guidance for decision-makers deciding prescribed alteration and establishment and discontinuance proposals

April 2016

“Demand v need

This states, “Where a Local Authority (LA) identifies the need for a new school, to meet basic need, section 6A of EIA 2006 places the LA under a duty to seek proposals to establish a free school via the ‘free school presumption’. However it is still possible to publish proposals for new maintained schools outside of the competitive arrangements, at any time, in order to meet demand for a specific type of place e.g. places to meet demand from those of a particular faith.”

FOI requests to GBC and SCC show that no approaches have been made to sponsors or proposers to set up a Free School.

SCC was asked:

With regard to the proposed new secondary school in Normandy, can you please tell me which Academy or Free School has approached the County Council proposing sponsorship arrangement for the new school. If neither has made the approach can you please advise me on what basis an approach has been made, and by whom, and how this fits with Government legislation regarding new schools

SCC responded:

“The County Council has not received any approaches regarding sponsorship arrangements for the new school. It has not invited any such approaches as it would be too early to do so at this stage. If and when the new school is progressed, the process to do so would be aligned with the Department for Education’s guidance on the establishment of new schools.”

So, SCC admits that no planning has yet taken place about approaching sponsors or proposers to set up a Free School and this would only happen when “the new school is progressed”. Therefore the land could be taken out of the Green Belt on the assumption that a sponsor or proposer may be found, but this may not happen. By then the land would have been removed from the Green Belt and the school may never be built.

As no sponsor or proposer has been sought I question the legality of the school being included in the proposal for the site.

The document “DfE Guidance for decision-makers” continues:

This states, “The decision-maker should take into account the quality and popularity of the schools in which spare capacity exists and evidence of parents’ aspirations for a new school or for places in a school proposed for expansion.”

I can find no evidence in the Local Plan that GBC or SCC have sought “evidence of parents’ aspirations for a new school”.
FOI requests were made to GBC and SCC to ascertain what considerations had been given to enlarging existing schools.

SCC (GBC referred me to SCC) was asked:

What consideration has been given to enlarging existing schools rather than building a new school?

SCC responded (and with GBC’s knowledge):

“Excluding possible demand from the draft Local Plan, two expansions are planned to meet the existing demographic demand. 20 additional places per year are being provided at Guildford County and 30 places per year at St Peters from September 2017. Including demand from the draft Local Plan, further options to expand existing schools are limited, would not provide for the level of demand from the Local Plan and locations of existing schools would not necessarily serve the developments proposed in the Local Plan.”

In a conversation with the School Commissioning Officer for SCC I was told that “there is limited scope to enlarge existing schools or increase rolls”.

SCC was asked:

Please provide me with information that shows the published admission number of the proposed new school in Normandy (how many forms of entry), and how this has been calculated.

SCC responded:

“It is too early to define the admission number of the proposed school in Normandy. This would be largely dependent on the number of housing developments progressed for which a new school may serve, taking into consideration any capacity in existing schools closer to the time when the places are needed.”

So they say that this “takes into consideration any capacity in existing schools closer to the time when places are needed”. This contradicts the earlier answer where they state “further options to expand existing schools are limited and would not provide for the level of demand from the Local Plan.” It appears that SCC does, in fact, accept that there is spare capacity in existing schools.

SCC was asked:

1. What formal meetings or conversations have taken place between Councillors or Officers of Surrey County Council and Headteachers/Chairs of Governors of secondary schools in Guildford Borough, including those just over the County Boundary in Hampshire, regarding:
   • strategies for increasing the intake, if their school is undersubscribed
   • increasing the published admission numbers for their school
   • enlarging their school premises to increase their admission number as opposed to building a new secondary school in the west of the Borough

1. Any financial calculations that have been made to compare the cost of enlarging existing schools in Guildford Borough to cope with increased numbers of pupils arising from the local plan with the cost of building a new school at Normandy, assuming that the serviced land will be provided by the developer

2. The concern that Headteachers and Chairs of Governors have about a new school reducing the intake to their school

The School Commissioning Officer for SCC told me that there are often discussions with schools regarding their intake and spare places. However, she was unable to confirm that any formal discussions on these issues had taken place related to the current draft Local Plan. She confirmed that, because SCC does not believe that it is possible to expand existing schools, no calculations have been made to compare the costs of enlarging existing schools with the cost of building a new school. It was also clear that there have not been any discussions with Headteachers or Governors about the impact that a new school may have on the rolls of existing schools.
However, research by the village’s County Councillor has shown that the responses from SCC may not accurately reflect the situation, as many existing schools are actually undersubscribed and others would be happy to expand, with the existing capacity making a new school unnecessary, taking into account the planned expansions at Guildford County and St Peters. Headteachers and Governors of these other schools are concerned that a secondary school in Normandy would take pupils from their schools, reducing their numbers.

The County Councillor’s research shows:

- Kings College is currently 57% undersubscribed. The capacity at the school is 900 pupils, and there are only 389 on the school roll (43% utilised) with 511 vacancies. There is capacity on that site to further expand the school, to accommodate more pupils well into the 2020's if then needed
- The Headteacher of Kings College says, "There is absolutely no need for another school in Guildford; its crystal clear"
- The New Guildford University Technical College, due to open in 2018, will take 240 pupils from the age of 14 in its first year, and that will double to 480 places, relieving pressure on other schools
- Christs College is already taking 30 more pupils a year than its admission number, because it has the space and capacity to do so, and is willing to take still more as it has further capacity
- Ash Manor, Ash, has a capacity of 1,050 and it has 940 pupils, so is undersubscribed by 110 places. The Governors are supportive of the school being expanded to take more pupils by 30 places a year (so a total of an extra 150).
- The Head and Governors of Ash Manor School have very strong concerns about a new school in Normandy, just three miles away, and the possible negative effects on their intake. Other Headteachers must have the same fears
- Connaught School, just over the County Boundary in Hampshire, is also undersubscribed by 90 places and is available to Surrey children
- Hoe Valley Free School, Woking, has an intake of 120 per year, with currently 95 pupils, so is undersubscribed in its first year by 25 and welcomes applications from Guildford parents. It will build up with 120 new places available every year for 7 years - making a total capacity of 840. It has no catchment area, and although it will mainly serve Woking, it will welcome applications from Guildford parents

So, there are currently 736 vacancies at the nearest secondary schools serving the western parishes - not accounting for the 480 extra at the new Technical College to open in 2018, and GBC is already providing 20 additional places a year at Guildford County and 30 places per year at St Peters from September 2017.

The above vacancies are the equivalent of more than a whole secondary school, which negates the need to build a new school at this strategic site. Coupled with this, the birth-rate in Guildford has fallen over the past two years, and whilst it is too early to know if that trend will continue, it is another factor to urge caution, and not to proceed to build a new secondary school at this time.

Appendix C of the Local Plan, Infrastructure Schedule SED3, states the need for, “A 7-form entry (7FE) secondary school at the Normandy / Flexford strategic development site. Only 1 FE would be needed to serve the strategic development site itself, the remaining capacity would serve the wider area, including Blackwell Farm strategic site.”

The GBC Local Plan: Strategy & Sites 2016 – Part 2: Sites, shows that the Blackwell Farm site could potentially accommodate 1,800 houses and have a need for a 2FE Primary school. This would project into 2FE that would need secondary school accommodation from Year 7.

Therefore, there is a need shown between the Normandy/Flexford and Blackwell Farm sites for 3 forms of entry. This leaves 4 forms of entry to “serve the wider area”.

A FOI response from SCC stated that “The proposed secondary school in Normandy would serve Normandy, Blackwell Farm and Ash, which could be around 4,366 homes. This number of dwellings could yield around 785 secondary aged children. This estimate is based on formulae that calculate the likely average yield from new developments.”

If the Normandy/Flexford and Blackwell Farm sites produce 3 forms of entry from 2,900 homes, this means that the remaining 4 forms of entry would come from 1,466 homes, so somehow the maths does not add up here and shows yet
again that GBC does not know the number of pupils that will require a place, but are happy to remove the land from the Green Belt without any assurance that the school will be built as the number of pupils requiring a place may not make the school viable.

The document “DfE Guidance for decision-makers” continues:

“Travel and accessibility”

This states, “Decision-makers should satisfy themselves that accessibility planning has been properly taken into account and the proposed changes should not adversely impact on disadvantaged groups.

The decision-maker should bear in mind that a proposal should not unreasonably extend journey times or increase transport costs, or result in too many children being prevented from travelling sustainably due to unsuitable walking or cycling routes.

A proposal should also be considered on the basis of how it will support and contribute to the LA’s duty to promote the use of sustainable travel and transport to school.”

Further information is available in the statutory “Home to school travel and transport guidance for LAs” dated July 2014. This makes it clear that the 1996 Education Act “places a general duty on local authorities to promote the use of sustainable travel and transport.” With regard to school travel plans the guidance states that “Effective plans (should) reduce car use …. reducing congestion caused by school runs”. It also states that “Specific school routes audits are considered good practice.”

The guidance stresses repeatedly the message that “Local walking, cycling and bus strategies should inform the local authority’s duty to promote sustainable school travel” and “the sustainable school travel should …. provide health benefits for children …. through active journeys, such as walking and cycling”

Appendix C of the Local Plan, Infrastructure Schedule AM5, states the need for an “Off-site cycle network from the land to the south of Normandy and to north of Flexford site to key destinations including Wanborough railway station and to the Christmas Pie Trail, with improvements to a level that would be attractive and safe for the average cyclist.”

This will not be delivered until 2021/2033, is not costed and will be paid for by the developer. It could be that the cycle network is not completed until 2033, 17 years in the future, which would preclude its use as a means of getting to school for a generation of cyclists.

The Christmas Pie trail itself is not mentioned in the Infrastructure Schedule for improvement, and is a convoluted route both west and east, which is unlit, muddy, often flooded and passes through dense woodland and is most definitely not a child-safe route. A FOI response from GBC confirms that no planning has been carried out regarding the suitability and safety of this trail for schoolchildren who may wish to use this route.

The humpback bridge in Glaziers Lane would be hazardous for cyclists travelling to and from the school and, because of the narrowness of the bridge, no dedicated cycle lane could be installed. Similarly, the single track road under the railway bridge in Westwood Lane would be extremely dangerous for cyclists travelling to and from the school.

There is no information in the Draft Local Plan about any proposals for safe walking routes from the Blackwell Farm development or from the Ash direction to this strategic site.

As there will not be safe cycling and walking routes from either the west or the east of the site, parents will undoubtedly bring their children to school by car. No pre-planning has been carried out on the road infrastructure to ensure that these journeys will be safe, as shown below.

Under FOI GBC and SCC were asked (GBC referred me to SCC):

What research has taken place to see how the local rural roads will cope with the increase in traffic that the new school will bring, especially with regards to the railway bridge in Westwood Lane which only accepts one-way traffic and has a height limit, and the dangerous hump-back bridge in Glaziers Lane which has a weight limit
What road safety issues concerning parents parking on Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane to drop off and pick up their children have been considered?

SCC responded:

“As Surrey have not undertaken any specific research on either the ability of local roads to cope with traffic that may be associated with a new school, or on road safety issues specifically related to parents parking on Glaziers and Westwood Lanes, there is no information to provide on these two points. This would be looked at as part of the planning application process.”

In a conversation with the School Commissioning Officer for SCC it was confirmed that her department had not carried out any surveys to ensure that the supporting road infrastructure could safely service a large secondary school on this site.

So SCC (and with GBC’s knowledge) admits that no planning has taken place about whether the local roads provide a safe infrastructure for the school or could cope with the increased traffic that a new school would bring alongside the traffic from a new 1,100 home development. Neither have they considered the road safety issues of parents parking in the narrow country lanes around the development to drop off or collect their children from the school. Therefore, it could be decided at a later stage that the roads are not safe and are not able to cope with the increased traffic, but by then it would be too late to prevent the construction of 1,100 homes as the site would already have been taken out of the Green Belt.

FOI requests to GBC and SCC show that little or no consideration has been given to accessibility planning for a new school.

SCC was asked (GBC referred me to SCC):

How will pupils be transported to this secondary school?

SCC responded:

“This will be determined and planned in detail at a later stage. The draft local plan includes appropriate train routes.”

So SCC (and with GBC’s knowledge) admits that no planning has yet taken place about the transportation of pupils to the school. The response also indicates that the land could be taken out of the Green Belt before any decisions have been made about the safe transportation of pupils to the school. Therefore, it could be decided at a later stage that this would not be a safe site for a school, but by then the land would have been removed from the Green Belt.

The response above that “The draft local plan includes appropriate train routes” is misleading as the station from the Blackwell Farm development (Guildford West – Park Barn) may not be completed until 2029, 13 years in the future, although the school on the Normandy Flexford site would be expecting take 300 children from the Blackwell Farm development, without train, cycle or pedestrian links.

In the outline planning application for the site at Roker’s Farm, which includes a 5FE Secondary School, the “Framework School Travel Plan” and the “Transport Assessment” are models of good practice. Its action plan shows that much thought has been given to the travel plan strategy to ensure that the site has good accessibility by a range of safe transport modes, including on foot and by cycle, as well as roads and pavements that are safe for young people to use, and dedicated drop-off and pick-up spaces for parents to use. This is in contrast to the total lack of forethought or planning that has been given with regard to the school on the Normandy/Flexford site, where the rural roads and footpaths are totally inadequate to support a large school and there are no safe walking or cycling routes. SCC says that these issues will all be looked at as part of the planning application process. Therefore there is a presumption that the Local Plan will be accepted with a school on this site and that matters will proceed naturally as part of the planning process. So, if it is decided that there are insufficient reasons to place a school on site A46, the land will have been removed from the Green Belt without any justification whatsoever, allowing developers to build houses on what should have remained a Green Belt site.

The document “DfE Guidance for decision-makers” continues:
“Funding”

This states, “The decision-maker should be satisfied that any land, premises or necessary funding required to implement the proposal will be available and that all relevant local parties (e.g. trustees or religious authority) have given their agreement. A proposal cannot be approved conditionally upon funding being made available.

Where proposers are relying on the department as the source of capital funding, there can be no assumption that the approval of a proposal will trigger the release of capital funds from the department, unless the department has previously confirmed in writing that such resources will be available; nor can any allocation ‘in principle’ be increased. In such circumstances the proposal should be rejected, or consideration deferred until it is clear that the capital necessary to implement the proposal will be provided.”

Ref. the document: “New Schools Network” (Newschoolsnetwork.org)

Premises – Finding the right school for you

“The DfE have said that they expect all Free Schools to open in existing buildings, which can be refurbished or extended in order for them to function as schools. The DfE will be unlikely to allow schools to open in a new building. They will only grant Free Schools a ‘new build’ where there is no other viable option in the local area but the advantages of the proposed school outweigh the cost of building. You should not assume that you will be able to open your Free School in a new building. Where Free Schools do occupy new premises, these will be built under much tighter financial constraints than previous government building programmes, such as ‘Building Schools for the Future’ and will most likely be of a modular construction.”

However, GBC has included a new-build school on the plans for this strategic site, in spite of the fact that the DfE may well not allow this to happen.

The LAA makes it clear that funding will be needed for the construction of the school as it is stated that “The site will provide land for a 7FE secondary school.” An FOI request to GBC and SCC shows that no consideration has been given to funding for a new school.

GBC and SCC were asked:

What capital funding is being provided by the Department for Education for a new Secondary School on the strategic site between Normandy and Flesford that is mentioned in the draft Guildford Local Plan. This is to include any confirmation in writing from the DfE that such resources will be available for the new school.

SCC responded (GBC claimed they did not hold the information requested):

“It is too early for considerations to have taken place with regard to this enquiry; therefore no such documents are available.”

So, if the proposal for the new school has to be rejected because capital funding for the construction has not been approved, or there is no confirmation that resources will be available, then surely the school shown on the strategic site has to be removed from the plans, as GBC and SCC have not confirmed that funding will be available. If the school is removed so are the “exceptional circumstances”, and so the Green Belt should be protected, otherwise the land will be removed from the Green Belt without any assurance that the school will ever be built.

As no funding for the school has been approved I question the legality of the school being included in the proposal for the site.

Because of the above points, I believe that GBC’s lack of planning, with regard to the provision of a new school on this sensitive site, has not shown that this is an “enabling development” nor that there any “exceptional circumstances” that would allow the site to be removed from the Green Belt, and I therefore wish to object to the proposal on the grounds given.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
**STRATEGIC SITE A46 – NORMANDY/FLEXFORD**

1. **SUSTAINABILITY & SENSITIVITY**

I believe that GBC has incorrectly used data to show the sustainability of Flexford and Normandy and therefore its suitability for development. My rationale is given below.

Two of the key concepts that underpin the local plan are ‘sustainability’ and ‘sensitivity’. Individual settlements are ranked on both counts, and development is favoured in the most ‘sustainable’ ones; conversely, the barrier is higher in the most ‘sensitive’ ones. What is significant is that for the purposes of assessing ‘sustainability’ Normandy and Flexford have been treated by GBC as one settlement, whereas for ‘sensitivity’ they have been treated separately. This could almost have been designed to give us the outcome we have, as in terms of ‘sustainability’ all the assets from the two settlements are aggregated - which maximises its score on this count – but in terms of Green Belt ‘sensitivity’ the open area between the two settlements is disregarded – which reduces our score there. GBC has not been consistent here.

**Sustainability**

With regard to the Briefing Note that the Councillors had at their meeting on 13 April, para 3.4 says that since the last version of the plan the Council had commissioned further work on the Green Belt and Countryside Study and on a new Green Belt Sensitivity Map. The Summary of the Briefing Note (para 8.2) states that while the new plan claims to give more protection to the Green Belt (one of the major strands of the consultation feedback last time) we are an exception to this approach. To quote from the paper:

“Three exceptions to this approach demonstrate it has not been slavishly followed. The new strategic site at Normandy and Flexford, which was previously safeguarded for future development, has been allocated for 1100 units and will contain a 7 form entry secondary school. The sustainability of the site is further increased through the rail station and the critical mass created to help the existing villages support day to day services and facilities.”

In other words, GBC has gone against its approach towards ‘sensitivity’ for reasons related to ‘sustainability’. That is why putting together Normandy and Flexford for the purposes of the latter, while keeping them separate for the purposes of assessing the former, is so significant.

The July 2013 document ‘Guildford Borough Settlement Profiles’, page 47 (section 16.0) states that Normandy and Flexford are treated jointly; the section is headed “Normandy and Flexford - the local community consider Flexford to be a part of Normandy” and, further on it is stated: “Normandy Parish Council considers Flexford and Normandy to be one village. We have therefore assessed and scored it on this basis.”

What this means is that, for example, the bus that serves Normandy is treated as an asset to Flexford, and the train that serves Flexford an asset to Normandy. All of this contributes to a conclusion (still in section 16) that includes the statement: “it is clear that more development here (i.e. Flexford) incorporating a mix of uses could improve the sustainability of the existing settlement and that of nearby Normandy.”

This thought is repeated in the May 2014 document “Guildford Borough Settlement Hierarchy”, In para 6.4 this states: “There are other settlements that have been identified through the evidence gathering such as…Flexford and Normandy which would benefit from future development and improved access to key services for local residents.”
In other words, Normandy and Flexford together are seen as a suitable site for future development. In this connection it is significant that the tender document produced by GBC regarding further work to be done on the Green Belt and Countryside Study includes the statement, under the heading “Significantly expand a village”, “An initial assessment based on previous consultation, desk-top research and our settlement hierarchy suggests that areas with greatest potential include the countryside such as land between the villages of Normandy and Flexford… Significantly expanding or merging villages would utilise more effectively the services and facilities that are already present there whilst at the same time be of sufficient scale to enable additional supporting infrastructure.”

So, as far back as a year ago at least, GBC was suggesting that a merged settlement of Normandy and Flexford was a prime candidate for ‘significant expansion’. I understand that the developer has been working on this proposal for quite some time, certainly since before the publication of the latest version of the plan, and at least as far back as 2014.

Sensitivity

However, another criterion that has to be met is that of ‘sensitivity’ in terms of the Green Belt, and here GBC commissioned a new document to consider which villages might be ‘inset’ from the Green Belt.

With reference to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) the document examines the case for either leaving individual villages within the Green Belt or taking them out. It quotes the relevant part of the NPPF as follows:

“NPPF paragraph 86 notes that if the open character of the village makes an important contribution to the openness of the Green Belt, the village should remain washed over by the Green Belt.”

I understand this to mean that if a village is bounded by natural or man-made features it is deemed not to have an ‘open’ character and therefore does not contribute to the openness of the Green Belt. The document considers – separately – the villages of Normandy and Flexford and concludes that they are both self-contained and therefore are not ‘open’ in the sense explained above.

In the case of Flexford the significant comment is: “In summary, it is considered that Flexford to the south of the railway line should be inset within the Green Belt due to: The difference in open character to the north and south of the railway line, with high density development and enclosure more evident to south of the railway line in comparison to the north”

There is a distinction between Flexford south of the railway line and Flexford to the north of it, and the explicit acknowledgement of the openness of the area to the north – which is now designated to accommodate 1100 homes plus a secondary school!

Nothing could demonstrate better the false logic of considering Normandy and Flexford as a single settlement for purposes of ‘sustainability’ but as separate ones for the purposes of Green Belt ‘sensitivity’. On the map in Appendix 8 – Village Insetting Boundaries Map, the green lines enclosing the two settlement areas that it is proposed to ‘inset’ from the Green Belt, separated by a vast area of open land, can be seen. In other words, if you treat Normandy and Flexford as a single settlement as per the ‘Settlement Hierarchy’ it is clear that the open spaces between the two parts of the settlement do “contribute significantly to the openness of the Green Belt” and that, as per the NPPF, the whole area should remain ‘washed over’ by the Green Belt and not be available for development. But this is denied by keeping them separate for the purpose of assessing Green Belt ‘sensitivity’.

So, what we have is one set of criteria applied to achieve one purpose (establishing the ‘sustainability’ of Normandy/Flexford and therefore its suitability for development) while a contradictory set of criteria is applied to achieve another (the disqualification of a ‘Green Belt’ defence against development). I believe that this demonstrates a major flaw in the GBC Local Plan, and so I wish to object to the proposal on the grounds given.

1. **THE STRATEGIC HOUSING MARKET ASSESSMENT**

I believe that the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) is seriously flawed and overestimates the objectively assessed housing needs (OAN) in the borough up to 2033. It is of great concern that the analysis supporting the conclusions reached in the SHMA, which was published in September 2015, have not been made available for public review, nor has it been reviewed in detail by GBC, or by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
My main concerns regarding the SHMA are:

- The 2012 based Subnational Population Projection (SNPP), which G L Hearn claim is a robust starting point, is significantly distorted by an unusual increase in the number of overseas students attending the University of Surrey between 2006 and 2011.
- The 2012 based SNPP forecasts the population to decline by 1,800 by 2033. Therefore the overall projected increase in Guildford’s population to 161,300 is entirely due to the projected growth in net international migration of 23,000 of which, according to the ONS, 57% are foreign students who would normally be expected to move away from Guildford at the end of their studies. The Government has already announced that foreign students will no longer be counted as immigrants, as students come and go.
- Un-attributable Population Change (UPC) shows that between 2001 and 2011 the population of Guildford decreased by 717. It is assumed that this is because of foreign students returning home. However, G L Hearn has declined to make any adjustments for UPC.
- The 2011 Census measured the term time address of students as being their main place of residence, when in reality they will not become heads of households as most will move away at the end of their studies. This has a major and disproportionate effect on projecting household formations.
- GBC has included unoccupied houses in its housing targets. The NPPF states that this should not happen.
- There is no justification to include 25 houses a year to accommodate students as the University forecasts a much smaller increase in student population from 2013 to 2033.
- 120 houses per annum are included in the SHMA to support economic growth. This growth cannot be forecast with any degree of certainty as it depends on so many variables and it is not clear how this figure of 120 has been arrived at. Some of this growth will probably arise from construction work necessary to build homes for the workers who form part of the original economic growth. Serious consideration is required to avoid this “chicken and egg” situation.
- The impact of the European Referendum on projected migration up to 2033 should be assessed.
- GBC should investigate whether there has been any “policy on” intervention that has had the effect of promoting housing in Guildford in excess of the “policy off” needs, and should issue a specific statement accordingly. If applicable, housing need assessments should be repeated accordingly.

I wish to object to the Local Plan as I believe the SHMA is seriously flawed and the objectively assessed housing need is based on false information or information that is not up-to-date. The SHMA should be open to review by all parties and the housing needs assessment repeated using correct and up-to-date data.

1. INFRASTRUCTURE

Wastewater and flooding

Appendix C ‘Infrastructure Schedule’ WCT5 proposes an “upgrade to wastewater infrastructure if assessment (at developer’s cost) shows that additional capacity is needed to provide for Normandy/Flexford.” This to be delivered in years 1 – 15, by Thames Water, with the cost still to be decided, but paid for by the developer and Thames Water.

There has been sewer flooding in Glaziers Lane for decades. My own garden has been covered in sewage on two occasions during severe storm conditions, and other gardens locally have been similarly affected. In 2014 Glaziers Lane was closed for over 2 weeks when sewer reconstruction work took place owing to blockage problems. Last year sewer work was carried out for weeks along the main road in the village (A323) owing to the inability of the system to cope with the sewage from the homes. The current sewer at times cannot cope with sewage from the existing volume of homes without occasionally ‘backing up, and overflowing into gardens, let alone an additional 1,100 homes.

Surrey County Council is the Lead Flood Authority for Surrey, and as such keeps records of all reports made to it of localised flooding problems and they record a high concentration of flooding problems in the roads surrounding site A46. Over several years, the Normandy Flood Forum has been coordinating action with not only SCC and GBC, but the Environment Agency, Thames Water and other agencies to alleviate these issues. The proposed building of over 1,100 additional new homes and a secondary school would overshadow all previous issues in terms of potential flooding risks. Parts of Normandy, including the area next to the Hoe stream, have been and are subject to severe flooding problems, and the associated release of sewage into people’s properties and into the Hoe stream which would cut across the...
development. The Hoe stream also floods, which affects Glaziers Lane at the bridge crossing the stream, and sewage has been released into it, causing a health hazard.

The site currently allows natural drainage through the soil. If this area is built on the resultant run off of surface water would overwhelm the present system, causing even more flooding in the local area.

Thames Water is well aware of the problem of sewer flooding. In their response to a very recent planning application for just 30 homes in Glaziers Lane they stated “Thames Water has identified an inability of the existing waste water infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this application… the development may lead to sewage flooding” and this could be for 15 years if the delivery date to upgrade the sewage system is delayed. Whatever any proposed solutions there may be, I am very concerned that it will not be possible to cope with the increased amount of water and resulting flooding and sewage if this site is developed with 1,100 homes.

It is clear, therefore, that the wastewater infrastructure already requires an “upgrade”, and this will be an extremely expensive undertaking for 1,100 homes, with the cost still unknown, but to be borne in part by the developer. I wish to object to the proposal to build 1,100 homes on strategic site A46 on the grounds that:

- the existing wastewater infrastructure will be unable to cope with 1,100 extra homes
- no costings have been carried out to upgrade the wastewater infrastructure to accommodate 1,100 extra homes, nor to ascertain if the developer will be able to meet these costs.

Electricity Supply

Appendix C ‘Infrastructure Schedule’ EG6 proposes to “upgrade electricity supply should capacity assessment conclude it necessary at Normandy/Flexford site.” This to be delivered in years 1 – 15, by UKPN, with the cost still to be decided, but paid for by the developer and UKPN.

The electricity supply in Normandy is notoriously unreliable and households suffer from frequent power cuts, especially in storm conditions. This situation could be exacerbated for 15 years if the delivery date to upgrade the system is delayed.

It is clear, therefore, that the electricity supply would need an “upgrade” and this will be an extremely expensive undertaking for 1,100 homes, with the cost still unknown, but to be borne in part by the developer. I wish to object to the proposal to build 1,100 homes on strategic site A46 on the grounds that:

- the existing electricity supply will be unable to cope with 1,100 extra homes
- no costings have been carried out to upgrade the electricity supply to accommodate 1,100 extra homes, nor to ascertain if the developer will be able to meet these costs.

Healthcare

Appendix C ‘Infrastructure Schedule’ does not include any improvements to Healthcare to go alongside the inclusion of 1,100 homes on strategic site A46 as well as a 60-bed nursing home.

The local doctors’ surgery is already overstretched and nationally it is accepted that the recruitment of GPs is extremely difficult. It is clear that no planning has taken place as to how the existing healthcare facilities in the village, or beyond, could cope with at least 2,500 extra residents, as well as the needy residents in a 60-bed nursing home.

I wish to object to the proposal to build 1,100 homes on strategic site A46 on the grounds that the existing healthcare facilities would be unable to cope with the increased population, and that no planning has taken place to ensure that acceptable medical care would be provided for the new residents.

The Village Green

The GBC Local Plan: Strategy & Sites 2016 – Part 2: Sites, states that, “The village green will be in a central location within the development site and form a focus for the community.”
The NPPF states that there should be early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods regarding the needs and priorities of the village. This has not happened with regard to the village green and other facilities. Had such engagement and collaboration occurred, GBC would have been told by villagers that we do not need another village green as we already have one on Manor Fruit Farm, which is the hub of the village for sport and leisure. Here there is the Village Hall and large car park, playground facilities, adult fitness “green gym”, a bowls club, an archery club, the Therapy Garden, and extensive green spaces for recreation and walking. Shortly there will also be a “trim trail” around the perimeter of Manor Fruit Farm to encourage villagers to exercise. It is planned for senior and junior football, baseball, rounders and softball teams to move to Manor Fruit farm in the future, and there are plans to build a new pavilion here with changing facilities. A little further away in Hunts Hill Road are play facilities for older children and the village’s tennis club. A new village green would divide the village, not “form a focus for the community”. Again, this is clearly a developer-led initiative, planned from a distant desk, without any understanding of what the village does or does not need.

I wish to object to the proposal to build 1,100 homes on strategic site A46 on the grounds that there has been no engagement or collaboration between GBC and the neighbourhood regarding an additional village green that is not required, nor for any of the other “facilities” that are planned, as required by the NPPF.

**Developer’s contributions to improve the infrastructure**

It is astonishing that developer contributions are allocated within the ‘Infrastructure Schedule’ without any idea of the cost of some of these, which include:

- Major road improvements £2.8m
- Improvements to the bus network TBD
- Improvements to the cycle network TBD
- Upgrade to the electricity supply TBD
- Upgrade to the water supply TBD
- Upgrade to the wastewater infrastructure TBD
- Provision of SANG TBD
- Serviced land for a 7FE secondary school (cost unknown)
- Expansion of Wyke secondary school TBD

It is of further concern that, since the vote to leave the European Union, shares in housebuilders, including Taylor Wimpey, have plummeted. There must be a concern at GBC that in the future this developer may be unable to fulfil its commitment to build the homes, provide the land for the school or make the developer contributions that are expected. Perhaps GBC should take a pragmatic view not to put all its eggs in one developer’s basket when maybe smaller developments are more viable for developers.

I wish to object to the proposal to build 1,100 homes on strategic site A46 on the grounds that the land could be removed prematurely from the Green Belt without any assurance that the developer will be able to meet these unspecified and cumulative costs, nor to provide the serviced land required for the school.

1. **THE THAMES BASIN HEATH SPECIAL PROTECTION AREA (TBHSPA)**

The strategic site A46 is situated only 800 metres away from the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area and so is within the 400m – 5km zone of protection. The TBHSPA contains a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) recognised as one of the key Natura 2000 European sites...

I wish to object to the Local Plan on the ground that the ecology and wildlife of the area will be threatened by the damaging impact of pollution from the increase in traffic that an 1,100 home development will bring, no matter what avoidance or mitigation measures are implemented.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
MY OBJECTIONS ARE THESE:

1) BUILDING A SECONDARY SCHOOL:

I've done a bit of investigating, and I understand that Ash Manor (Ash/Tongham) and King's College (Park Barn / West of Guildford) are undersubscribed and potentially failing schools.

Under current legislation with the Department of Education, surely these schools could be run directly by the government in order to improve standards. Change the management / teachers and so forth.

The facts are that both schools are in highly populated areas, with a pool of students to continually draw from.

Also, surely it is eco-friendly and safer for all the obvious reasons to have children living close to their schools.

There's also a huge assumption that the proposed new school:

1. Will draw from the proposed development of new homes. Of course the existing population in Normandy. One has no idea who will buy these homes. It is perfectly possible that these children could go to a wide number of private schools in the surrounding areas, or, other state schools.
2. There is absolutely no guarantee that a new school will be a “great” school. Reputations take time to build, and the staff need to be attracted and retained.

**Pro-active Alternative Plan: For King’s College:**

I recommend a new site over the railway from within Surrey Research Park (where a new station could be built, easing pressures on Guildford town centre).

There's also access to Surrey Sports Park to keep the children fit, and maybe an experiment with University of Surrey to work from Primary through Secondary School to ensure children have the key skills from an early age. This could be a breakthrough partnership.

I know the BIG issue is funding. Surely a creative partnership involving Guildford Businesses and the new schools could provide the employees of the future, along with lifelong learning initiatives.

Also, there has to be alternative funding to a builder's profits. We need to get benefactors interested. Companies who want to sponsor etc. I totally understand the squeeze on Council finances, but that is no excuse to bulldoze through a village forever.

2) INFRASTRUCTURE & ENVIRONMENT:

Normandy has well-documented issues with:

- **2 railway bridges that are frankly dangerous** - and that Network Rail know this as fact. This could be catastrophic in the future as previous repairs have never resolved the structural problems.
- **Roads that have poor access:** Glaziers Lane / Flexford Road & Westwood Lane in particular:
1. a) There's a very dangerous junction at Guildford Road / Westwood Lane & School Lane, which is absolute chaos at opening/closing time for Wyke Primary School in Normandy.

1. b) There’s also the crossroads of Westwood Lane & Flexford Road – a site which has seen many serious accidents over the past 30 years. This could increase exponentially if the new development goes ahead.

1. A323: Over the years there has been increasing traffic-flow on this road due to the development of the A31 upgrade & A331. Both for peak-time traffic, and specifically when there are accidents on these roads, which happen frequently. For instance, a bridge would need to be constructed at Ash railway station to ease congestion. Westwood Lane is also a “rat run” for the A331 to the Hog’s Back when there’s an accident on that dual carriageway. So, with a school being built + the traffic from an incremental 1,100 houses being built, there would be gridlock.

- **High Flood Plain**: throughout the proposed development area. This will have catastrophic consequences if land is developed. There’s a Flood Forum already in place as issues are already widely known.

- **Insufficient Sewage / Drainage**: highlighted by “in-fill” developments in Beech Lane within past 5 years. This is a potential health-risk.

- **Threat to Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (TBHSPA)**: Normandy is home to extensive wildlife colonies and sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Also, it must be pointed out that there was an exceptional incident at the government’s Merial Animal Health Facility in Pirbright, Surrey a few years ago, which released poisons into the river stream. The repercussions were felt in Normandy, due to the interlinked drainage / river systems. If there’s future development in Normandy, this could be catastrophic.

3) **GREEN BELT**:

I have always believed that Surrey County Council / Guildford Borough Council MUST:

1. a) Build on brownfield sites FIRST, and overcome the challenges of these sites.
2. b) Re-cycle empty & under-used buildings & office blocks. Revitalise town centres (do we REALLY need that many shops?).
3. c) Re-use state owned assets (like what will be happening in Aldershot for instance).
4. d) In-fill sensitively. In Normandy we’ve built about 100 properties in the past 15 years. Same again is feasible. I do also think a sheltered housing proposition would be ideal, given the many people in the village who are elderly and want to downsize. This could re-cycle the ”housing stock”.

It will be a blot on the reputation of Guildford Borough council if such a project were to go ahead because it was "legally" acceptable. Building on protected Green Belt land will set a very dangerous precedence for the future.

Once land is gone, it cannot come back into use. More farmland is needed for a growing population.

Decisions affect people / environments and quality of life.

4) **NO MORE TRAVELLERS' SITES**:

Over the last 20-25 years, Normandy has become home to more than its fair share of travellers [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it].

There are ample sites throughout the borough elsewhere.

Specifically, we have at least 3 sites already.

5) **LEGAL ISSUES**:
I'm far from a legal expert. But I simply believe if it was NO for Normandy in 2014's Local Plan. I just don't see how the "legal context" has changed so drastically in two years. This is Green Belt Robbery - at a time when the country needs to be more sustainable and grow more of our own foods of all kinds. If anything, Normandy needs an entrepreneurial farmer who can revitalise our underutilised farmland.

At no time has there ever been any early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with our village. Taylor Wimpey have bypassed all protocols in submitting their 2014 plans.

**IN SUMMARY:**

Thank you for reviewing my reasons why I cannot countenance ripping out the heart of Normandy into the unknown. Coupled with the chaos it will bring to thousands of people's lives for many, many years.

Carefully thought through, the existing secondary schools in Ash & Park Barn can survive & flourish under new management. I've worked in many turnarounds / relaunches in my business career. The same can be done for these schools.

There are many major environmental, infrastructure, “quality of life” issues and day-to-day practicalities that are flatly ignored by Strategic Site A46’s proposed development of Normandy. Let alone all the legal & procedural protocols that have not been followed or adhered to.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3245</th>
<th>Respondent: 8768417 / Casper Gorniok</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We fully support the removal of site allocation A46. It was proved beyond all doubt that there was no strategic case for the secondary school to be sited in Normandy.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3248</th>
<th>Respondent: 8768417 / Casper Gorniok</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We object in the strongest possible terms with regards to including a plot to the South West of Flexford. As mentioned in our objection to Amendment 2 - Normandy simply doesn't have the infrastructure to cope with increased traffic. Plus, we are very aware of the desires to build on land towards the Hog's Back which is totally and utterly unacceptable. We thought that The Surrey Hills (which this is part of), was exempt from any house building whatsoever.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1974  **Respondent:** 8794657 / Diana Delahoy  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to object to the Local Plan re proposal to build 1100 houses at Normandy, because it seems to ignore several local factors. It does not seem sustainable, as the area is already struggling.

The roads in Normandy are in a very bad state of disrepair, and are not coping with the existing traffic, so extra housing will make this even worse. A31 from Puttenham to Guildford is almost at stand still from 7.00am to 9.30am each weekday. There seems to be no plan to repair or upgrade the roads. There are 2 buses a day from Flexford, (& these are to be cut from September), so it is essential to run a car, meaning probably at least another 2200 cars on the local roads!

There are no shops in Normandy, so another reason why a car is a necessity.

The GP surgery has not been able to cope with the local population for some time, and this is getting worse. One cannot get an appointment within 3 weeks, so one may be better (or dead) by that time. There is no capacity for an increase in population.

The suggested reason for building 1100 new homes is the need to build a new secondary school. How is this necessary when most of the secondary schools in the area are far from full? Also, it is increasingly difficult to recruit secondary school teachers in Surrey area, so how will a new school be staffed?

Has anyone consulted the utility companies about supplying so many extra homes? Water and electricity are essentials.

We have fought hard to get a reasonable broadband speed in Normandy. Will this be maintained to us as well as the new houses?

While accepting that people need somewhere to live, I cannot accept that 1100 new houses in a small village is a practical option, and I urge you to reconsider all the factors listed above.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2246  **Respondent:** 8794657 / Diana Delahoy  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Just to say that I am very pleased and relieved to learn that site A46 has been removed from the Guildford Local Plan.

The proposal to build over 1000 new houses in the Normandy/Flexford area was horrific because the roads, Gp surgeries, utilities etc do not cope with the current population.

Increasing the population would take facilities beyond breaking point.

However, I understand there is still a commitment to build 10,000 homes in the Guildford area, and I urge you to carefully consider what improvements will be needed (roads, GPs, utilities etc) to support this, BEFORE agreement is given to go ahead with building.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) has left the Plan even further unbalanced against the North East of the Borough with over 40% of the development proposed in this small area of Green Belt, all within just 3 miles of Send Marsh.

The potential for a substantial increase in industrial floorspace from 7000 sq m to an unspecified amount at the site A58 Burnt Common does not provide local residents with enough information for a full and proper consultation given the ambiguity and lack of detail within the document.

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a and does not allow for full and proper consultation.

The increase in housing numbers from 45 to 60 at Site A42 in Tannery Lane, Send will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around and within Ripley. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states “Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays.” And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

Brownfield sites A4 and A34 have been removed from the Local Plan – meaning there is more pressure on Green Belt sites to meet the so-called housing “need”.

On Affordable Homes, the previous version of the plan (Policy 4.2.23) stated that Developers will be expected to provide land for affordable homes at nil value. Now it just says “Off-site provision or payment in lieu is expected to enable the same amount of additional affordable housing as would have been delivered on site. Developers don’t even have to build any affordable homes which defeats the point.

I’d like to register my complaint that the above development is being considered. There are so many reason why this is not a good idea but allow me to outline a few:

1. This is greenbelt area and there are no exceptional circumstances that have not been approved by the inspectorate.
2. the flood risk will become a major issue as this development concretes over vast amounts of wetlands.
3. Habitats for wildlife are supposed to be protected but this development will damage what little habitat they still have.
4. We need to safeguard the countryside from the sprall of urbanisation. This only increases the sprall.
5. there is no need for a secondary school in the area given that 3 major secondary schools in the area are way below capacity.
6. We seem to value space for park and rides but not for nature and peace and quiet. This development will only exacerbate the problem.

I’d like to register my complaint that the above development is being considered. There are so many reason why this is not a good idea but allow me to outline a few:

1. This is greenbelt area and there are no exceptional circumstances that have not been approved by the inspectorate.
2. the flood risk will become a major issue as this development concretes over vast amounts of wetlands.
3. Habitats for wildlife are supposed to be protected but this development will damage what little habitat they still have.
4. We need to safeguard the countryside from the sprall of urbanisation. This only increases the sprall.
5. there is no need for a secondary school in the area given that 3 major secondary schools in the area are way below capacity.
6. We seem to value space for park and rides but not for nature and peace and quiet. This development will only exacerbate the problem.
Comment ID: PSLPS16/5931  Respondent: 8805569 / Carolyn Piggott  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I STRONGLY OBJECT to the proposed development of site A46 in Normandy.

I object on the following grounds:

1) the plan does not demonstrate exceptional circumstances to justify that the proposed development area (A46) is removed from the green belt, and what effect removing this area from the green belt will have on the local area.

2) the need for a new secondary school is not proven and research into the number of vacant places in other nearby secondary schools shows that they are undersubscribed. You cannot justify the need for a school based on development of houses in this area.

3) the increase in traffic could not be supported by the road system and it is unfeasible that people moving to the area would all use the train, most people living in this type of location do have cars. The roads are already saturated with traffic with a large number of cars using the A323 to commute from Aldershot/Camberley/Farnborough to and from Guildford. When there are problems on the A31 (frequent) or A3 (also frequent) then the A323 takes a large amount of the traffic away from these roads.

4) the impact on the environment and local sustainability have not been addressed. Normandy is an important natural area and if removed then Guildford is in danger of merging with Aldershot/Camberley/Farnborough and creating urban sprawl.

5) the local population have not been kept fully informed of this proposal from the earliest time possible.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1235  Respondent: 8806849 / Roland McKinney  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

I object to this site

Building on this site will result in the merger of the villages of Flexford and Normandy, which is contrary to the policies in paragraph 80 of the NPPF. Although the NPPF uses the words neighbouring towns, the aim is clear - and this is recognised by GBC in that they want to prevent the village of Ash Green merging with Ash and Tongham. How they then find it lawful to propose to deliberately merge Normandy and Flexford is confusing.

This inappropriate development will cause great harm to the green belt, and create more traffic and air pollution. these are covered in more detail in the attachment.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  📄 Site objection.pdf (617 KB)
I am writing to object to the proposed local plan for Normandy and the scale of new development being considered.

I was very surprised to learn that it is being planned to increase the number of homes in Normandy by 100% - adding 1,100 new homes, plus a secondary school for 1,500 pupils, and 6 traveller pitches.

I am well aware that there is a housing shortage, and that we should be prepared to expect a level of new homes in Normandy, but to double the number of homes will be an excessive intrusion in to a mainly rural area, and must surely be against planning policies and principles.

The land between Normandy and Flexford is, I am told, Grade 3 arable and pastoral land, and this plan will cover this entire area with housing. As this is the only remaining open rural area in the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area, then surely the area requires special protection itself.

The TBHSPA is designed to protect rare species, but if we continue to break up large open areas then even common species are likely to become rare.

To add such a large number of houses, suddenly filling in an area that was not urbanised and largely open rural land, is bound to have a much higher impact on the areas needing protection than if the same number were added to the edge of an existing highly urbanised area, or to a brownfield site.

We are lucky in Normandy not to have many street lights, we can actually sleep in the dark, and see the stars at night. I doubt that such a large development would be allowed without a lot more street lighting being required to meet modern standards. This increased light will be unwelcome not just for the people living in and Normandy and Flexford, but also for the wildlife.

We already have two very difficult junctions at the bottom of Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane (particularly this one), and these will only get more difficult and dangerous with the significant increase in cars (approx 2 per home), plus all the extra traffic that a school for 1,500 pupils will create. The local roads are not designed for such a volume of traffic.

Just because someone says they will build a school should not be a good enough reason for excessive new development in green belt and open fields. There is no need for a school here, and to build so many homes to provide pupils for a school that wasn’t needed is ridiculous. Research says there are enough brownfield sites in Surrey for well over a million homes. So surely there will be a brownfield site on the outskirts of Guildford that can provide that school where it’s needed – not in the middle of nowhere. Not only that but if Ash Manor and Kings college are undersubscribed then where is the so called need for a school between the two.

I have also seen it mentioned that there would be much needed new retail space provided as part of this development, as if the people of Normandy and Flexford were suffering from a lack of shops. These days it’s unnecessary to have shops on the doorstep as the supermarket will deliver almost anything you could need at anytime – if we needed the luxury of local shops, we wouldn’t choose to live here in the first place.

Please don't break the election promise to always protect the green belt

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
To whom it may concern:

I am writing to object to the proposed development at Normandy, Surrey for the following reasons:

I gather GBC are required to demonstrate ‘exceptional circumstances’ to justify the release of Site A46 from the Green Belt. There is no clear evidence of any exceptional circumstances within the Local Plan that justify this. It does not take into account the red sensitivity status of the site, and there is no evidence why such a vast development needs to be developed on this sensitive area, as opposed to other more well suited locations.

I gather the whole reason this development is being proposed is because of the ‘so called’ need for a Secondary school in the area, otherwise this site would not even be considered. However councillor Keith Witham I believe has conducted an extensive survey which highlighted that within the local secondary schools there are currently 736 vacancies at the nearest secondary schools serving the Western parishes – not accounting for the 480 extra at the new Technical College to open in 2018 – a combined capacity of 1,216. In addition I believe SCC has already approved expansions at the County School, Guildford and St Peters. In addition to this, the birth-rate in Guildford has fallen over the past two years, so this is another reason why deciding to proceed now, could be a devastating waste of our countryside. The case for the need for a new secondary school in Normandy is therefore not proven or needed and therefore I believe this development should not go ahead.

TRANSPORT & ROADS

The roads surrounding the proposed site are already full of traffic, and roads such as Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane, are just not designed for the volume of traffic proposed. The huge lorries that we currently have to cope with, along with cars travelling too fast, I’ve already had two cats killed within a year on Glaziers Lane, they can’t cope with the volume of traffic as it currently stands, let alone any further development. Cars don’t stick to the speed limit and young children are already vulnerable on these roads, let alone if lots of other cars were to come along. The railway bridges are old and won’t cope with the additional cars and the headroom of the Westwood Lane bridge would prohibit double decker buses from accessing the proposed school.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

A development on this scale, would kill off thousands of beautiful wildlife that surround the area. This is an environmentally sensitive location next to one of the component SSSIs of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area for birds.

There are many vitally important ecological networks that surround the proposed development area namely Ancient and Semi-natural Woodland, Veteran Trees, Hedgerows, Semi-improved Grassland, Farmland and a Stream, this proposed development would destroy a number of these habitats including Semi-natural Woodland, Veteran and Mature Trees, Hedgerows, Farmland and Semi-improved Grassland, plus would have indirect effects on Ancient Woodland habitat and the Stream through pollution (light, noise, litter and diffuse land and road runoff). A number of protected species have been recorded within either the proposed development site or 500m to 1km of the proposed development site. These include Hedgehogs, Dormice, Great Crested Newts, Barn Owls, Stag Beetles, Skylarks, Common Toads, Common Lizards, Grass Snakes, Adders, Slow worms, Badgers and Bats (including potential roosts within a number of veteran and mature oaks and other trees across the proposed development site and within the woodland blocks).

Light pollution from this proposed development on this scale would be starkly visible from Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Effect on surrounding woodland and stream habitats that adjoin these roads including the SNCI’s of Normandy Common, Normandy Pond and Wyke Churchyard.
I also think the pollution levels of the increased traffic in the area, could well be damaging for people’s health, particularly those of the elderly and young, of which, Normandy has many.

**INFRASTRUCTURE**
The local roads, Church, Primary School, Doctors and Library just can’t cope with such a huge development planned.

**To SUM UP**

I moved to Normandy nine years ago, as I loved the open green fields and rural and small village like feel. Having the green open fields provide a great environment for enjoying the benefits of fresh air and exercise, both for me and my children. It’s a great place for children to learn and enjoy the wildlife, to see a deer bouncing along, or a rabbit running past or looking at all the colours on a Jay. It’s a great environment and one that is likely to be ruined if a huge concrete development was to be placed into the heart of the community.

While I understand that **SOME** development might need to take place, I do not feel that Normandy is a suitable place for such a vast development to be considered. Especially when there is no **EVIDENCE** that shows we have a need for it.

**PLEASE do not destroy the beautiful area that I live in and the habitat of so much wildlife**

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2200  **Respondent:** 8817505 / Michael Hughes  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is **Sound**? ( ), is **Legally Compliant**? ( )

I wish to object to areas of the proposed Local Plan with respect to Site A46 Normandy and Flexfords Strategic Site.

Firstly this was not considered as a strategic site in the first consultation and is not only now being considered for development but being urbanised which is in conflict with the Solihull ruling.

There is indeed a need for some development within the village in particular for affordable housing of a standard and size which would allow residents to downsize as their circumstances change and for young people to either rent or purchase a home. There is also a need for sheltered housing. Both this and the opportunity to down size would free up larger housing units for those wishing to purchase this type of accommodation.

These needs were shown in a survey which was taken within Normandy some years ago. GBC have certainly not engaged with the local residents concerning their needs. The size of the planned development will completely change the nature of Normandy. It seems likely that many of the proposed dwellings would not be purchased by local people or even Guildford residents but by people working in London and wishing to avoid the high cost of housing in the city by moving to an area outside the city but with good transport links. In which case there would be little benefit to Normandy residents.

There also appears to be some confusion in the language being used to justify the development of this land. It has been stated that the only reason for developing this site is because of the intention to build a school here whilst at the same time it is being claimed that the school is necessary here because of the number of pupils likely to be generated by the development of 1000 homes.

Whilst I agree that a further school will be required in the west of the GBC area, the Roker site would be far more suitable due both its position and the better links with the local bus system as well as the links which could be established with Merrist Wood College.
The question remains as to why when Taylor Wimpey submitted a plan for this development over 2 years ago no 'meaningful engagement' was made with the local community regarding the plan, most finding out only with the presentation of the final draft to the local plan. This is certainly not up to the standard of transparency in local government which should be expected and which would allow a full and meaningful dialogue regarding local residents needs.

The development as planned would require major upgrades to infrastructure in the area. Both sewage and drainage systems require investment now and this need would be far more extensive than presently required to support the level of housing suggested. The local road system is already overloaded yet the draft plan was voted through without The Strategic Transport Report having been made available and scrutinized, surely a most important document considering the traffic chaos which already exists in the Borough.

The draft plans, proposal to build 693 housing units per year is way beyond Guildfords needs and is more in line with London's intentions which appear to be to turn all surrounding towns into suburbs. Proposals already having been submitted for rail services to Guildford and others to come under TFL.

There is no proof of 'Exceptional Circumstances' existing which would allow Normandy and Flexford's boundaries to be changed.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3430  **Respondent:** 8817505 / Michael Hughes  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

The removal of the plan for 1100 homes on site A46 is welcomed however should other proposals in the draft be carried out the danger is that this land will gradually be developed should developers put forward a convincing arguement to GBC. The worst senario would be the piecemeal development of the area over an extended period which would create housing but no appropriate facilities. This land has been noted by inspectors as essential for the openness of the green belt in the area and this is even more important with the new developments which are proposed, and some approved in the Ash and Tongham area which are gradually reducing the area of open land seperating Aldershot and its attached conurbation from Guildford.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLP16/923  **Respondent:** 8819425 / Chris Kelland  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the proposed development of the above site for the following reasons.

Normandy Parish Council are very much opposed to any such development, as are our County and Guildford Borough Councillors. In a recent joint communication, Keith Witham (SCC) and David Bilbe (our representative at GBC) said...
“We need to be clear that this is far from a done deal. The number proposed is simply too high and we need to challenge the empirical logic and evidence.”

In a letter to our constituency MP, Jonathan Lord, even the Leader of GBC Council has stated,” In all honesty if it was not for the education provision I would not have agreed to this site being included in the plan.” The need for a new school in this area is very dubious (see below.) In a personal letter to me Jonathan Lord, our MP, states, “I’m extremely sympathetic to your concerns and am myself appalled and aghast at the proposals.”

It appears that not only are the villagers of Normandy opposed to this proposal, we have the backing of all our democratically elected representatives and even doubts within the Council.

My own objections to this proposal, which I have already made known to the Executive, are as follows:

1.) This land is currently in the Green Belt and should be protected as such both now and in the future. Green Belt status has not been removed from this site. Prime Minister, David Cameron is on record as having declared that “there are no plans to relax the strong protections that prevent inappropriate development on the Green Belt.” And again, “We will always protect the green belt and make sure planning decisions are made by local people.” I take it that this means people who actually live in the vicinity of any proposed development.

I attended a meeting at Normandy Village Hall in February this year where villagers were assured by GBC Councillors that this particular piece of land was considered a sensitive site and, therefore, there were no plans to develop it.

We now know that a major construction company had already produced plans for a massive development of this site on a scale that would double the size of Normandy. GBC Planners were well aware of this proposal in advance of the February meeting.

I understand that there are exceptional circumstances in which certain areas of Green Belt land can lose their status in favour of important development. One of these exceptional circumstances might be the provision of a school although there seems to be no legal evidence that this is true. The inclusion of a new Secondary School on this site was obviously part of the original proposal and is included in order to justify the loss of Green Belt status.

However, the need for this school is extremely dubious given that two of the local secondary schools that serve Normandy, namely Ash Manor and King's College, are under-subscribed. Other secondary schools serving Normandy are being extended to cope with Guildford's ever increasing needs, although these needs themselves are dubious and are based on GBC's unsustainable housing quota.

The need for a new secondary school must be incontrovertibly demonstrated before any such loss of Green Belt land can be considered.

2.) Before any Green Belt land is destroyed by development, full consideration should be given to the existence of Brown Field Sites, (that is previously developed land.) There are sites within the urban areas of Guildford, with its main line station and very good infrastructure, which are far better suited for development. Indeed, with far more on-line shopping now being carried out, buildings in the Town Centre itself will become vacant and ideally suited to change of use to dwellings.

3.) As a member of the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England, I would draw your attention to CPRE's recently expressed view that “developers already have planning permissions outstanding for 650,000 homes and there are brown field sites available for another one million homes. We have to stop the over development now, before we wreack our green spaces for ever. Building on brown field sites can mean regeneration; building on open fields is destructive and environmentally disastrous.” I would urge Guildford Councillors to resist pressure from Central Government to ruin our beautiful British countryside. It should also be noted that this site is close both to Sites of Special Scientific Interest and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. In the past planning inspectors have recognised that Normandy's green fields contribute to the openness of the green belt and the panoramic view of our green areas to the Surrey Hills AONB.

4.) A particular potential problem that concerns me personally is the matter of drainage. Surface water from the whole of Beech Lane and copses to the west of my property is discharged beneath the railway track, crosses Westwood Lane and is
ditched across the land the subject of this proposal, towards Glazier's Lane and beyond. In the event of excessive rainfall, this discharge backs-up and causes extensive flooding in Beech Lane. This is evident not only in Beech Lane, but in flooding in Westwood Lane where the surface water is piped beneath the highway. My property has been flooded internally on two occasions due to this back-up and this has been exacerbated by the flooded sewer discharging contaminated water into my property. A personal and financial disaster!

The current system for the disposal of surface and foul water from Beech Lane is grossly inadequate and any interference to it would be wholly unacceptable.

5.) This development would result in the loss of sustainable Agricultural Land.

This is valuable Grade 3 arable pasture land and any destruction of it will have a devastating effect on wildlife and destroy our rural environment.

6.) This site is bounded on two sides by minor roads, both of which are currently congested during busy periods especially when there are traffic problems on the A31 Hog's Back and vehicles are redirected through our village.

The busy Aldershot/ Guildford road to the north of the site is currently even more congested. To add to this just one vehicle per proposed household (an unrealistic figure) together with cars dropping off and collecting numerous school children will cause unacceptable chaos and pollution in Normandy.

I shall be grateful if all members of the Council will take these points into consideration when discussing the GBC Local Plan and reject any proposal for the development of this site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3922  Respondent: 8825825 / Rebecca Young  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Objection to proposed Strategic Site A46 ( Land Between Normandy and Flexford ) and Comments on Guildford Borough Council Local Plan

Objections to Site A46 (Land Between Normandy and Flexford)

I object to the proposed strategic site (A46) between Flexford and Normandy and the development of this green belt land for a school, housing and commercial use.

I believe this proposal is in contradiction to the government's strategy of protecting the green belt. In addition, local residents were assured by Guildford Borough Council (GBC) in February 2016 that this green belt land is of “red sensitivity” and therefore only to be considered for development as a very last resort. The NPPF requires “early and meaningful engagement “ with neighbourhoods and local organisations. It is hugely disappointing to discover that GBC have been engaged with Taylor Wimpey to develop this proposal since 2014 without input from local community groups or residents.

“Exceptional Circumstances” must be proven in order to remove land from the green belt according to the National Planning Policy Framework (ref Strategic Site A46)

• The need for a new secondary school located between Normandy and Flexford has not been demonstrate A number of the secondary schools in the west of the borough are under- subscribed (most notably Kings College
which is currently 57% under-subscribed). I understand that a circular argument has been used in an attempt to justify a new secondary school – ie the removal of Site 46 from the green belt for housing is generating the demand for the proposed school, to be built on the same site.

GBC has not demonstrated the demand for a new secondary school based on the current population, nor the predicted future population of the borough. GBC needs to reference legal precedent for releasing green belt land for housing development based on estimated future demand for school places.

- The land between Normandy and Flexford is not a sensible choice for a secondary school even if the demand could be demonstrated in the A site closer to the urban population centre would be a more logical and sustainable choice. It would seem that Site A46 is an entirely developer led proposal to create a new urban centre.

- It seems unethical for a developer to obtain the right to develop a green belt site that would otherwise not be considered for housing at the current time by offering future provision for a secondary school.

The collaboration with the developers to create a commercial proposal for this site seems to be a key part of releasing this land from the green belt.

**Destruction of Rural Environment , Impact on Wildlife, Sustainability and Infrastructure ( ref Strategic Site A46)**

The proposal to build 1100 homes plus a 1500 pupil secondary school on this site would mean a doubling of the combined size of the Normandy and Flexford hamlets. It is disproportionate and would radically change the character of the area.

This “developer led” proposal would destroy the open space between Normandy and Flexford, which are two distinct settlements, and would significantly add to the creeping urbanisation of the west of the borough. This land plays a key role in the separation of Normandy, Flexford, Ash and Ash Green.

Development on this scale would have a devastating affect on wildlife in and around the settlements of Normandy and Flexford, fragmenting ancient woodland, destroying hedgerows and increasing light pollution. The Taylor Wimpey Concept Masterplan leaves very little open land for birds of prey to hunt in and the required “green corridor” looks extremely thin due to the developer's proposed high housing density. I have personally seen several species of birds of prey (including Red Kites and Peregrine Falcons) hunting and soaring over this land.

- GBC make unsubstantiated claims that development of Site 46 will “lead to an improvement in services for existing residents”. GBC has not provided evidence that existing residents would like to be urbanised in this way.

- Draft Local Plan Policy A46 states as a requirement “Create a sustainable and inclusive community, that can meet its day to day needs within the community”.

Given that most new residents will have to commute to work and only a fraction of those journeys will be practical / cost effective by train, this statement is ill-defined. No evidence has been presented that demonstrates the current residents' behaviours regarding train usage. I have little confidence that a shop would be viable, based on anecdotal evidence from similar developments.

- Policy A46 also states “The secondary school to be located in close proximity to Wanborough railway station, encouraging sustainable travel movements” I would like to question the alleged “sustainability” of locating a 7 form entry secondary school north of Fle Pupils are unlikely to use the train due to the lengthy distance they are likely to have to travel from the outskirts of Guildford to a Guildford station (including the new proposed station near Park Barn) and the prohibitive cost of the fares. Similarly for pupils from Ash and Tongham. It will be cheaper and more convenient for them to be driven. GBC has not proposed any measures to encourage or ensure that pupils travel to the school by public transport, particularly by train, to justify this policy.
GBC are proposing to improve the Christmas Pie Trail “to a level that would be attractive and safe for the average cyclist”. I am familiar with this route into Guildford, some of which is under a significant depth of water in the winter months. I am concerned with the lack of detail regarding such improvements and what impact such measures would have on the environment and wildlife.

An increase in population of this size would also pose a significant threat to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area which is approximately 1km away from this site. Does such a development satisfy the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework? Is there any evidence that the provision of 10ha of SANG (Taylor Wimpey Concept Masterplan) will provide adequate (or any) protection?

The local minor roads are unsuitable for such a large development and the associated traffic. Wanborough Hill is often queuing back from the junction under the A31. The junctions of Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane with the A323 are bottlenecks and accident hotspots. Glaziers Lane is a D Class road with narrow sections, a hazardous hump back bridge and a hair pin bend. The junction of Flexford Road with Westwood Lane is also hazardous due to limited visibility as it is on the brow of a hill. Westwood Lane is little better as it is restricted by the single lane section under the railway bridge. It is difficult to see how these roads could be improved sufficiently even if budget were unlimited.

GBC has not defined any road improvement proposal to accommodate the additional traffic from 1000 plus homes and a secondary school, nor have they considered how any improvements would be in keeping with the character of the area and respectful of the quality of life of existing residents.

Normandy and Flexford residents already suffer from flooding. The area is on clay, there are several natural springs and the water table is often only approximately 20cm below the soil surface in the winter months. Covering a large area with concrete will make matters worse. It would appear that GBC's Surface Water Management Plan is inconsistent as it has excluded the land north of Site A46.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2650   Respondent: 8825825 / Rebecca Young   Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) 

I SUPPORT the REMOVAL of proposed Strategic Site A46 from the revised Local Plan because, in summary:

“Exceptional Circumstances” must be proven in order to remove land from the green belt according to the National Planning Policy Framework, these were not provided.

The proposed need for a secondary school was not justified.

In any event, site A46 was a poor choice to locate a secondary school as it is too far from main urban centres and therefore would have lead to an unsustainable traffic increase.

The proposed Site A46 was not proportionate to the size and character of the existing settlements of Normandy and Flexford.
Development on this scale would have a devastating affect on wildlife in and around the settlements of Normandy and Flexford, and have a negative impact on the nearby Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area which is approximately 1km away from this site.

The local road network is severely limited and would not support the additional traffic that would accompany such a development, even if funds were made available for improvements.

Normandy and Flexford already suffer from flooding issues being sited on clay and having many natural springs, development of this magnitude would increase the problem.

Please refer to my email to Guildford Borough Council of July 2016 (sent from [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998]) in response to the 2016 draft Local Plan for my original comments and further details.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4408  Respondent: 8826113 / Grahame Todd  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am a resident of Flexford, which is one of the Hamlets that makes up the Parish of Normandy (there are 6 in all).

I am writing with my objections to site A46, land proposed to be taken out of the Green Belt to construct 1100 properties. My reasons for objecting are as follows.

1. **Fails National Planning Policy (NPPF)**

The proposal for site A46 is inappropriate as it will change irrevocably the rural environment of Flexford and Normandy and urbanise it. Very few people moved to Flexford or Normandy in the hope that one day that it would become like Ash and Tongham (once villages now soulless urban areas).

Site A46 fails the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) guidance, in that the ‘needs and priorities’ of the local populace of Flexford and Normandy have not been decided by them but are being imposed. The NPPF ‘provides a framework within which local people and their parish councils can produce their own and distinctive local and neighbourhood plans reflecting their needs and priorities of their communities’. The NPPF 155 states that ‘early and meaningful’ engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods, local organisations is essential’. There has been no meaningful engagement from Guildford Borough Council (GBC) and the local communities in Flexford and Normandy. Quite the opposite in fact, GBC have been in discussions with Taylor Wimpy for the last 2 years and documentation for Site A46 was submitted on behalf of Taylor Wimpy to GBC approximately two years ago. No engagement with the local community or representatives had taken place at this stage. One has to wonder in that engaging with a developer and excluding the local community, are GBC in breach of NPPF.

1. **No proven need for a secondary school**
The whole premise of developing site A46 is on the basis of the need for a secondary school, however all the evidence suggests that local schools in GBC area are undersubscribed, therefore the justification of taking land out of the Green Belt doesn’t stack up.

In its last submission to Guildford Borough Council (July 2014), Surrey County Council, in its official response, said: "A site within the proposed urban extension at Blackwell Farm, with all necessary access infrastructure built in and a catchment surrounding the site, would be a more sustainable location in transport terms for a new secondary school to serve the western side of Guildford."

Why has Guildford Borough Council not taken heed of this advice from Surrey County Council?

The birth rate has fallen in the past 2 years and secondary schools to the west of the Borough are undersubscribed as stated below from direct research by Councillor Keith Witham of Surrey County Council.

Undersubscribed Secondary Schools

Kings College, Guildford.

The school is currently 57% undersubscribed. The capacity at the school is 900 pupils, and there are only 389 on the school roll (43% utilised) with 511 vacancies. Kate Carriett, Principal at Kings College has said very clearly and I quote: "There is absolutely no need for another school in Guildford, its crystal clear". She also said that when Kings College IS fully subscribed, there is capacity on that site to further expand the school, to accommodate more pupils well into the 2020's if then needed.

The New Guildford University Technical College

This is due to open in 2018, and will take 240 pupils from the age of 14 in its first year, and that will double to 480 places, relieving pressure on other schools.

Christs College is already taking 30 more pupils a year than its admission number, because it has the space and capacity to do so, and is willing to take more still as it has further capacity

Ash Manor, Ash

The capacity of the school is 1,050 and it has 940 pupils, so is undersubscribed by 110 places. When Cllr Keith Witham met the Head Teacher and Chairman of Governors he was told that if needed they are supportive of the school being expanded to take more pupils by 30 places a year (so a total of an extra 150). They also expressed very strong concerns about a new school in Normandy, just three miles from their front door, and the possible negative effects on Ash Manor.

Connaught School

This is near Ash, just over the County Boundary in Hampshire - but is also undersubscribed by 90 places and available to Surrey children.

Hoe Valley Free School, Woking.

This brand new Secondary school only opened last September. It has an intake of 120 per year, with currently 95 pupils, so is undersubscribed in its first year by 25. But it will build up with 120 new places available every year for 7 years - making a total capacity of 840. It has no catchment area, and although will mainly serve Woking, will welcome applications from Guildford parents.no catchment area, and although will mainly serve Woking, will welcome applications from Guildford parents.

So there are currently 736 vacancies at the nearest secondary schools serving the western parishes - not accounting for the 480 extra at the new Technical College to open in 2018 - a combined capacity of 1,216. And In addition to those Surrey County Council has already approved expansions at the County School, Guildford and St Peters.
1. Essential characteristics of the Green Belt

The main aim of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open to check the sprawl of the urban areas. ‘The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence’ (NPPF). GBC is ignoring previous verdicts from planning inspectors that the green fields that make up site A46 contribute to the ‘openness’ of the Green Belt and panoramic view of those green fields to the Surrey Hills AONB.

Green belt in planning practice guidance states ‘Unmet housing need (including for traveller sites) is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the ‘very special circumstances’ justifying inappropriate development on a site with Green Belt (NPPF).’

1. Traffic Chaos and detrimental health issues

GBCs unrealistic plans for growth will force more traffic onto already stretched A roads and minor roads. Should this development go ahead, it will put extreme pressure on the roads that link up Normandy and Flexford. (These roads are classified at C16, Westwood Lane and Wanborough Hill plus Glaziers Lane, D60 unclassified road.

Construction traffic and, continual noise and pollution that will arise by the construction work will be excessive. The planners have not fully considered the implications of the location of this site and the traffic impact that site A46 will have on a rural community

If Normandy and Flexford is fully developed approximately 800 traffic movements will occur each hour. This will significantly increase the pollution levels in the hamlets, in particular for those who border site A46. No regard seems to have been given to the health and wellbeing of those people. Studies have shown that approximately 5% of the population die prematurely from poor air quality from traffic pollution.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
As a long standing Resident of Normandy, I wish to object very strongly about the draft GBC plan concerning Normandy on the following points:-

1. GBC has not demonstrated a clear need for a new large secondary school in this area. Similar type of schools in Ash & Guildford are undersubscribed. A large new School would need considerable additional expense on infrastructure.

1. The area is very susceptible to flooding. I have walked there often over the years & have seen places where there is a great deal of surface water. It is unsuitable land for a development of such a scale that is proposed.

1. It is a beautiful Green Belt area for Residents to enjoy & we do not require an enormous housing estate & school etc: to change our rural village into a suburb of Aldershot & Guildford. This Green Belt area is vital for every type vegetation, animals, insects & all human households in Normandy. Over many years it has been valued greatly & has been preserved by many Nature Conservation Societies.

1. All the roads, both main roads & small roads in this area get very congested. There is often a problem on the A3 or the A31 & this causes chaos in Normandy. To have such a large increase in traffic with the proposed plan would need a big road building plan to cope, & it is not clear where this road would go.

There are two railway bridges which provide very narrow access to the area of planned building between Glaziers Lane & Westwood Lane. Both these D & C roads are unsuitable for an increase in heavy traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:


Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the draft local plan on the grounds that Normandy does not need a secondary school.

A46 Strategic site was not proposed in previous documents and whereas it was “Safeguarded” it is still greenbelt land.

Keith Witham’s painstaking work of visiting all the nearby schools and discovery without doubt that they all have vacancies, 736 in fact, shows that a school is certainly not needed, in particular in a rural area on the edge of the borough in the middle of nowhere. Not to mention the 480 places which will be available at the new technical college in two years’ time. Over 1000 vacant school places already. A school in Normandy would be an empty embarrassment for GBC. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify the development of this greenbelt.

I object to the local plan because any development on A46 would hugely exacerbate the local traffic issues, Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane are just that, LANES. There is no way these 2 access lanes could be enlarged to carry double the amount of traffic. They are narrow, poorly maintained and with 2 dangerous railway bridges already the cause of accidents, one fatal, the village would be gridlocked in twice daily rush hours. This was proven this week while road works were being carried out on the A323 causing long tailbacks and bus delays of up to 40 minutes

The fragility of these lanes is illustrated by our cracked drain in Glaziers Lane for the second time and still awaiting repair.

Water pressure can vary and is poor in times of high demand
Drainage: The sewage system is inadequate for the existing population and overflows in the lane after heavy rain, polluting the stream.

Doubling the population in the west of a building development would be disastrous.

I object to the local plan in the grounds of sustainability. A46 is too close to the Thames Basin special protection area. Such a large development would have serious deleterious effect on the wildlife in the area.

Flooding. I object to the plan because most of Normandy is subject to flooding. (See Flood Farming meeting minutes) The fields in question in A46 form a safety ‘Sponge’ for the village. Many have rushes growing indicating they are permanently wet. The churchyard immediately to the north is frequently waterlogged and graves have to be pumped at times to permit burials – very unpleasant. Any Development in A46 would mean the ground water would be forced elsewhere and that means back onto existing dwellings. It has to go somewhere and in winter the ditches are often full.

Guildford Borough Council need to show they are ensuring ALL their brownfield land for building housing and building offices which stand empty.

They should convert existing empty commercial space to housing with a change of use.

History shows small planning applications for 1,2 or more small developments within the village have been consistently turned down by planning. These should be allowed to provide more housing in a more appropriate form where they are actually wanted.

This would have no impact on the infrastructure and would not rob us of our greenbelt.

It is quite obvious that site is cheaper and easier for planning to permit a few massive developments rather than lots of small ones. They should listen to what people actually want and if that had been happening for the last few years the housing crisis would be less accurate.

A46 is the Metropolitan Greenbelt, it is not ours to destroy. It is what gives Guildford its green and pleasant surroundings. And we need to preserve it as was originally intended.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1422  Respondent: 8832353 / Laura Bouncer  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to object to the planned development in Normandy/Flexford proposed in the GBC New local Plan to turn a large expanse of green belt land in Normandy over to a developer to build 1,100 houses on.

The government had pledged to protect the green belt, once gone we can never get it back, and this rural area will for ever be blighted with a massive housing development that is completely out of character with our current rural environment and will almost double the size of our village. I ask that you fight to honour the government pledge to protect the green belt!
To support this I’d like to flag a number of serious concerns with the draft proposal especially when brown field sites in and around Guildford appear not to be being developed.

The local plan cites the need for a school in Normandy. As it stands Normandy does not need a school, there are very few children of school age and most of the ones I know of get the train into Guildford to go to school. On top of this the information we have suggests that there are plenty of unused school spaces at existing schools in and around the Guildford area, more than sufficient for the future, so why build another school that will be underutilised!

The road infrastructure is really not suited to such a large increase in traffic:

In Glaziers Lane in the last 12 months we’ve had 2 sewers collapse and a water main leak. At least some of this has got to be down to the increase in car and lorry traffic. I know we’ve seen higher traffic volumes even since we moved here 6 years ago. On top of this if the A31 is ever congested, then Normandy becomes a “rat-run” to try and get into Guildford, which just brings everything in the village to a standstill.

There are two railway bridges that constrain the free movement of traffic. One on Westwood Lane, where traffic is limited to one lane to pass the bridge plus one on Glaziers Lane, there are two lanes here, but they are very narrow and angled slightly from the main road direction. At some point a lorry or other large vehicle will cause a major accident here as they, due to the angle find it almost impossible to stay on the their side of the road as they cross the bridge. I’m sure we’d all prefer to avoid such an incident rather than perhaps an innocent pedestrian walking to the station being hit.

In addition there is a 90 degree right hand bend where Flexford Road and Glaziers Lane join, another narrow, dangerous, unsighted corner where larger vehicles can only get around it on the wrong side of the road.

The north end of Glaziers Lane is also very narrow, if you stood on the corner for 10 minutes at pretty much any time of the day you will witness cars unable to keep to their side of the road as they come around the corner. Worse still buses or lorries entering the road cannot turn the corner without veering onto the wrong side of the road due to lack of room, many a time you have to stop in advance of the junction to let a large vehicle negotiate the road entrance. This dangerous situation will only get worse if the level of traffic increases.

The road cannot be expanded as there are houses on both sides of the corner, and it is also very close to two bus stops so pedestrians will also be put at risk on the pavement.

At peak traffic times the road already has extensive queues which will only be exacerbated by adding in 1,100 houses and at a conservative level 1,500 cars. This will have a knock on impact on the Aldershot Road and traffic into and out of Guildford, as well as encouraging yet more traffic to clog the Northern and Southern access points of the village.

Adding a School will only bring more cars into the area from all the parents, staff and service vehicles causing even more chaos. Further congestion will be caused by the fact that Westwood and Glaziers Lane have no parking areas other than in the road and so just maintaining a flow of traffic is likely to be an issue, something we’ve seen here the last couple of months with a couple of small road works that have been in place, and the resulting traffic queues.

There appears to be no provision for expanded or additional roads to ease the congestion in this proposal, and even if there were it is likely that such improvements will encourage more drivers off of the Hogs Back and creates even more of an issue for the Aldershot Road.

Our rural environment will be massively impacted by this, the last swathe of green between Guildford and Aldershot. We moved here to be in a more rural area, with a better quality of air, less noise and light pollution. As of today we can walk from our house in almost any direction into green fields. All of this will be irrevocably changed by such a proposal.
Noise and light pollution will increase significantly as will exhaust gasses damaging the countryside and therefore driving our wildlife away.

Wildlife in the area will be forced away by the building process and the loss of natural habit, once lost it will never return. We regularly get hedgehogs, bats, 2 different types of woodpecker, foxes to name but a few animals in garden, all of this will be changed by such a development. It is inevitably going to have an impact on them, not least the loss of their natural habitat.

The land in this area is supposed to be safeguarded, how can it now suddenly not be so?

As Grade 3 arable and pastoral land this should be protected.

It’s also an area where water naturally settles from the Hogs back and the North as Normandy is the low point of the area. Fields regularly get water logged and flooded in the winter. Adding yet more houses will have a knock on impact on not just this water table (forcing it into a smaller space and no doubt causing it to rise further as it has less space to occupy), but also overloading the local sewage system that is already stretched to capacity and issue for some houses in Glaziers Lane with one way valves needed to protect the houses at times of wetter weather.

There is increasing high density urbanisation around Ash and Pirbright Heath we need to protect our green space as supported by planning inspectors as our green fields contribute to the “openness” of the Green belt and from the Hogs back maintain the panoramic view of our green field, as a part of the Surrey Hills AONB.

Due to the points I have raised, I would urge you to remove the proposed development in Normandy, from the local plan for Guildford Borough. Conversion of empty offices in Guildford Borough and development of brown field sites would protect the green belt land before it is irrevocably lost. Guildford Borough would be a much poorer place to live in and less attractive to businesses if this development was to proceed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1132  Respondent: 8833857 / Gail Cook  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to this proposal. Development in the greenbelt on this site is wholly inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7067  Respondent: 8836129 / Roger Shapley  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This land is located with land parcel H12 as identified in GBCS Vol IV. The land is DEFRA agricultural land Grade 3A and has been farmed traditionally for pasture (sheep and cattle) and for grain (wheat and barley) in perpetuity. The land
contains many stands of scheduled Ancient Woodland. It is contended that the land contributes to the ‘openness’ of the Green Belt between the settlements of Flexford and Normandy and should remain ‘washed over’ by the Green Belt.

Legal Precedent

We object to the removal of the land allocated to Policy A46 by removal from the Green Belt by “inset” under NPPF para 83 and 84. We believe that current case law militates against the removal of land by the re-drawing of Green Belt boundaries without the express presentation in the written Local Plan of the “exceptional circumstances” proposed to redraw the Green Belt boundary for the land in Policy A46. We draw attention to the following cases

- Gallagher Homes Ltd v Solihull Borough Council [2014] EWHC 1283 (Admin), Hickinbottom J
- IM Properties Development Ltd v Lichfield DC [2014] EWHC 2440 (Admin), Patterson J

In the Solihull BC decision in particular “Exceptional circumstances are required for any revision of the boundary, whether the proposal is to extend or diminish the Green Belt. That is the ratio of Carpets of Worth.

Whilst each case is fact-sensitive and the question of whether circumstances are exceptional for these purposes requires an exercise of planning judgment, what is capable of amounting to exceptional circumstances is a matter of law, and a plan-maker may err in law if he fails to adopt a lawful approach to exceptional circumstances. Once a Green Belt has been established and approved, it requires more than general planning concepts to justify an alteration.”

We contend that no “exceptional circumstances “ for such re-drawing of boundaries have been offered by GBC in the context of the Local Plan process, so how can residents judge the veracity of this proposal?

Guildford Borough Settlement Profiles (July 2013) & Settlement Hierarchy (May 2014)

We object to the use of a 2010 survey of parishes that was not represented to parish councils as to be part of the Local Plan evidence base in an attempt to present the two settlements as one so as to better suit the pre-determination evident in the council officer’s thinking even at this early stage in the consultation. It is recognised in the Settlement Hierarchy that Flexford and Normandy are separate settlements, neither rank highly based on their individual sets of community facilities and services (Normandy 13, Flexford 27 sustainability ranking in Settlement Hierarchy report). It is disingenuous to represent them as a combined community. The ward contains five hamlets in a dispersed area. There is no traditional community centre. The incorrect assessment in the Settlement Profile document has been pointed out under Regulation 18 consultation but the council continues to include this flawed document as evidence. It should be discounted and removed from the evidence base.

Use of educational provision as “exceptional circumstances”

We object to the proposed site of Normandy/Flexford (Policy A46) for a new Secondary School; this should be rejected as the need for such a school in the location has not been proven.

In its last submission to GBC (July 2014) Surrey County Council, in its official response, said: "A site within the proposed urban extension at Blackwell Farm, with all necessary access infrastructure built in and a catchment surrounding the site, would be a more sustainable location in transport terms for a new secondary school to serve the western side of Guildford." Why has GBC not heeded this advice?

Every neighbouring secondary school is currently undersubscribed, Kings Manor in particular with 57% of its school places currently unoccupied. The birth rate which rose in 2011 and 2012 has reduced for the last two years, so building new schools now is a mis-direction.

GBC in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, May2016 indicate that SED 3, IDP p87, a 7-form entry (7FE) secondary school at the Normandy / Flexford strategic development site, requires only 1 FE to serve the development site itself, the remaining capacity would serve the wider area, including Blackwell Farm site (Policy A26). However, given that the proposed Blackwell Farm development is for 1,800 dwellings, on a pro-rated basis of children of secondary school age within the arising population, this would only require a maximum of 2FE. Together, the Blackwell Farm site and the
Normandy/Flexford site require only an estimated 3 FE provision. The proposed school is excessive in size, being more than twice as large (7FE) as the estimated need (3FE), and as other information provided here indicates, this is well within the funding and expansion capabilities of existing schools in the western wards of Guildford borough and the western side of the town.

The addition of forms of entry [FE] to current schools will be a much more cost effective and sustainable in the long term if there is a reduction in need – an empty classroom is cost neutral in terms of annual budgets, but an empty school is unsustainable, having spent millions of Pounds of Department of Education capital budget creating it, it would be a huge waste of money.

Adding forms of entry to several existing schools will see the costs absorbed after the initial capital cost needed to create a few extra rooms – but they still only require one headteacher, one set of staff etc. The Head Teacher and Chairman of Governors at Ash Manor School have offered to co-operate with a programme to expand that school, as had the Principal at Kings College - although now undersubscribed significantly, if it needs expansion in the future there is space and a willingness to do so.

If GBC wishes to proceed with this proposal, SCC Education Officers need to demonstrate a clear and undisputed need for such a school at this location, given the current under-subscription of all the neighbouring local secondary schools surrounding Normandy.

It should also set out how such a new school will be financed. If not, the site should be rejected.

Undersubscribed Secondary Schools
Kings College, Guildford
The school is currently 57% undersubscribed. The capacity at the school is 900 pupils, and there are only 389 on the school roll (43% utilised) with 511 vacancies. Kate Carriett, Principal at Kings College has said very clearly: "There is absolutely no need for another school in Guildford, its crystal clear". She also said that when Kings College is fully subscribed, there is capacity on that site to further expand the school, to accommodate more pupils well into the 2020's if then needed.

The New Guildford University Technical College
This is due to open in 2018, and will take 240 pupils from the age of 14 in its first year, and that will double to 480 places, relieving pressure on other schools.

Chris College, Guildford
This school is already taking 30 more pupils a year than its admission number, because it has the space and capacity to do so, and is willing to take more still as it has further capacity
Ash Manor, Ash
The capacity of the school is 1,050 and it has 940 pupils, so is undersubscribed by 110 places. The Head Teacher and Chairman of Governors are quoted as saying that if needed they are supportive of the school being expanded to take more pupils by 30 places a year (so a total of an extra 150). They also expressed very strong concerns about a new school in Normandy, just three miles from their front door, and the possible negative effects on Ash Manor.

Connaught School
This is near Ash, just over the County Boundary in Hampshire - but is also undersubscribed by 90 places and available to Surrey children.
Hoe Valley Free School, Woking.
This brand new Secondary school only opened last September. It has an intake of 120 per year, with currently 95 pupils, so is undersubscribed in its first year by 25. But it will build up with 120 new places available every year for 7 years - making a total capacity of 840. It has no catchment area, and although will mainly serve Woking, will welcome applications from Guildford parents. Consequently, there are currently 736 vacancies at the nearest secondary schools serving the western parishes - not accounting for the 480 extra at the new Technical College to open in 2018 - a combined capacity of 1,216. In addition to those, SCC has already approved expansions at the County School, Guildford and St Peters.
The birthrate in Guildford has fallen over the past two years and whilst it’s too early to know if that trend will continue, it is another factor to urge caution, and not to proceed at this time. The case for a new secondary school in Normandy is therefore not proven. If there is such a need elsewhere in Guildford Borough, we don't believe it is needed in the location proposed at Normandy.

**Contribution to the Purposes of the Green Belt**

We object to the express overriding by GBC of the contribution the land proposed for Policy A46 makes to the 5 purposes of the Green Belt in response to a developer-led proposal for large-scale house building in the Green Belt.

The evaluation of the ‘land parcels’ in and around Normandy and Flexford is laid out in the tables in GBCS Vol 4. The ‘land parcel’ that contains the land proposed for Policy A46 is H12, evaluated against 4 purposes of the Green belt it performs as follows:

- Checks sprawl of Normandy and Flexford
- Prevents Flexford and Normandy from merging
- Assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Guildford Borough Council recognises the contribution the land surrounding and within the settlements of Normandy and Flexford makes to the five purposes of the Green Belt in identifying land parcels H10, H12, H13, H14, H15, H16, J16 and J17 of particular sensitivity in its re-evaluation of the land parcels in the Green Belt & Countryside Study, Vol 2 Addendum, Appendix 1 and 2, reinforcing the evaluation in GBCS Vol 1

**Contribution to ‘openness’ of the Green Belt**

We object to the express rejection by GBC that the land proposed for Policy A46 fails to contribute to the “openness” of the Green Belt.

In the case of Normandy and Flexford, there have been two planning appeals concerning Gypsy pitches (Palm House Nurseries and Green Lane East) where the inspector agreed that land near Flexford and land to the west of Glaziers Lane exhibited ‘openness’. The inspector found in favour of the appellant on other grounds but the opinion on ‘openness’ in those judgements is evidence that the land around Normandy and Flexford is considered by the Planning Inspectorate to exhibit ‘openness’. A third more recent decision at appeal for housing development at North Wyke Farm found that the land contributed to the “openness” of the Green Belt.

- Palm House Nurseries GBC 09/P/01851, Application 12 November 2009 Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/A/10/2131590 Decision 24 Feb 2011
- Green Lane East GBC 10/P/00507, Application 8 March 2010 Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/A/10/2140630 Decision 14 June 2011
- North Wyke Farm GBC 14/P/00779, Application 17 April 2014 Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/W/15/3002308 Decision date: 14 July 2015

**Impact on Surrey Hills AONB**

The land designated as AGLV and identified as 12-1 in the Map AONB Boundary Review - Recommended Areas for Consideration and pp28-29 AONB Area of Search Evaluation - Natural Beauty Evaluation, Oct 2013 report to be added to the Surrey Hills AONB reinforces the proximity of valued landscape as it will add the north slopes of the Hogs Back overlooking Flexford settlement to the very boundary of Flexford settlement at Flexford Road.

Further, the land allocated in Policy A46 contains unrestricted view of the Hogs Back, part of the Surrey Hills AONB. Recent case law establishes that views out from open land to an AONB are as important as views into land overlooked by an AONB. Surrey Hills Management Board (of which GBC is a member) has submitted proposals to Natural England for land currently with local designation Area of Great Landscape Value on the north slopes of the Hogs Back above Wanborough and stretching down to Flexford Road at the southern boundary of Flexford settlement to be subsumed into the AONB and is currently awaiting ratification. The future potential presence of in excess of 1,000 houses visible at the periphery of the AONB with associated urbanising infrastructure (e.g. roads, perpetual street lighting, general light
pollution, loss of ancient hedges and trees etc.) would do great harm to the views into the AONB from the land between Normandy and Flexford and from the Surrey Hills AONB.

Therefore it is concluded that ‘land parcel’ H12 is Green Belt land that contributes to the ‘openness’ of Normandy and Flexford settlements also contributes to the ‘openness’ of the surrounding country side and adjacent Surrey Hills AONB. Consequently, both settlements should remain ‘washed over’ by the Green Belt as stated in NPPF para.86 “If it is necessary to prevent development in a village primarily because of the important contribution which the open character of the village makes to the openness of the Green Belt, the village should be included in the Green Belt”.

**Thames Basin Heaths SPA**

We object to the assertion that the creation of SANG will protect the rare ground-nesting bird species on this SSSI and Natura 2000 site from major disturbance and predation introduced by the building of 1,100 dwellings that rise to hundreds of adults and children, vehicles, dogs and cats within 1 kilometre of this internationally important wildlife habitat. Policy P5 is concerned mainly with how to support large scale housing development in close proximity to the SPA than with protecting wildlife habitat and biodiversity. It fails to address appropriate Monitoring Targets for unregulated vectors of disturbance generated from large-scale housing development within the 400m-5km mitigation zone.

Natural England is the government agency that champions the conservation of wildlife throughout England. They have advised the eleven local authorities with land in the Thames Basin Heaths, that new housing within 5km of the SPA may harm the rare bird populations. Larger developments located between 5km and 7km of the SPA may also be affected. This harm can be caused by disturbance to the birds from a growth in the number of walkers, cats and dogs frequenting the heathland, and other recreational uses created by additional housing.

The 2012/13 visitor survey report commissioned by Natural England on behalf of the Thames Basin Heaths Joint Strategic Partnership Board showed not a static or falling number but a 10% increase in visitor numbers since 2005:

- 66% cited dog walking as the main activity
- 80% of interviewed groups had dogs
- 67% of interviewed groups had dogs which were seen off’ lead
- 39% specifically visited the SPA site was because it was ‘close to home’
- the average distance travelled was just over 2.5 kilometres (80% by car)

Only 1% of visitors accessed the TBHSPA from the Normandy/Flexford direction, so the additional disturbance caused by the building and then occupation of 1,100 homes by 2,000-3,000 residents and 1,250 additional vehicles will be significant. Importantly, the prevalence of dog walking in the visitor survey suggests that the currently available SANG in the borough is ineffective in attracting those wishing to exercise dogs away from the TBHSPA.

Simply claiming that the 2012 visitor study data indicates success of the avoidance strategy in drawing people away from the SPA is no evidence at all. Where is data based on measurement of visitor numbers to the available SANG within Guildford borough? Where is the evidence that SAMM programmes have any impact on the behaviour of residents that are dog owners? This would be more compelling evidence. Without it, a planning inspector has no means of finding the proposal of large-scale housebuilding at these sites sound. In response to an email from NAG, Natural England have admitted that no survey evidence exists of the effectiveness of SANG or SAMM programmes in directing dog-walkers away from TBHSPA in Guildford borough or any of the surrounding local authorities.

A survey of households carried out by a veterinary team at Bristol University in 2010 “Number and ownership profiles of cats and dogs in the UK” published in the Journal of The British Veterinary Association indicates 31% households own dogs and 26% households own cats. Dogs were more likely to be owned by rural households.

Creating 1,100 homes on Green Belt land between the settlements of Normandy & Flexford implies, on average, 340 dogs and nearly 290 cats; all housing to be located within 1 kilometre of the SSSI; for a dog owner, a 2-minute drive or 10 minute walk away.
The proposed SANG schedule in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, May 2016 (IDP, SANG 13 p84) gives indication of neither the physical size nor location of bespoke SANG for Policy A46 (LAA Site 368); it is estimated that this proposed open space will be unable to cater adequately for 340 additional dogs plus their accompanying owners and there will be significant ‘leakage’ onto the TBHSPA.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3053  **Respondent:** 8836545 / Marian Sage  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I write to STRONGLY OBJECT to proposed Policy A46 development in Normandy and Flexford for which there are a myriad of reasons why this proposal should be withdrawn.

Normandy and Flexford should not be inset from the Green Belt.

There is no justification for a new Secondary School. There are others in the area very much under-subscribed. Some are expanding and could develop further as well as the new technical college opening in 2018, and another new school just opened in Woking. I will not quote specific schools and figures, as you will have had those quoted to you elsewhere.

Doubling the population and merging Normandy with Flexford at one stroke, will sound the death knell of current ‘village’ life and character.

The road network, already struggling at times would not cope with at least double the amount of traffic that this development would generate. Access to the A31 (Hogs Back) is difficult via Wanborough Hill and traffic Guildford bound is always stationary at this junction in busy periods and would be compounded many times over. The same would apply to traffic from Guildford and the B3000. Our local roads get used as a rat run when there are problems on either the A3 or A31. Westwood Lane (classified C16) has a height restricted single lane railway arch which limits vehicles, who then have to use Glaziers Lane D60 (unclassified) which has a narrow blind bridge over the railway. The A323 is already busy and would certainly not be able to cope. There is little, if any, scope for improvement of any of these roads.

Air pollution would increase affecting the health and lives of villagers, especially the vulnerable.

Environmental issues

The size of development of A46 will have a detrimental effect on the **Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).** With urban lighting spreading across the village, polluting the night sky and starkly visible from the Surrey Hills. This area contributes to the openness of the Green Belt and view of our green fields to the Surrey Hills.

The land, dismissed as just ‘fields’ is mostly valuable Grade 3 arable and pastoral land

**Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area** is within the 400m-5km zone, being less than a kilometre away. The development would cause air pollution, recreation use, ie human disturbance and dog walking. Dogs off the lead cause disturbance to ground nesting birds and other species and also to vegetation when owners do not pick up after their dogs. I’m not having a go at dog owners as I am one myself. Most dog owners are responsible but there is a significant few who are not.
A46 is surrounded by ancient and semi-natural woodland, veteran trees, hedgerows, farmland and a stream, which connect to other important sites within Normandy Parish and the wider countryside. It has similar habitats and losing these would affect the surrounding areas and have a highly detrimental effect on Walden’s Copse ancient woodland, which would be isolated and consequently have a detrimental effect on its viability. Continual fragmentation of natural habitat causes a frightening decline in our wildlife, affecting even our more common species. Compounded by the increased predation by the inevitable greater number of cats.

Under the NERC (Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006) all habitats in and around A46 are priority. Species include Hedgehogs, Dormice, Great Crested Newts, Barn Owls, Stag beetles, skylarks to name but a few.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7633  Respondent: 8837729 / Harry Clarke  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Policy A46 (Normandy & Flexford) – Object
   1. Loss of Green Belt Land
   2. Extension of Settlement Area of Normandy
   3. Extension of Settlement Area of Flexford
   4. Loss of biodiversity due to increased visitors to SSSI and SPA sites.
   5. Development within 5km of Thames Basin SPA, with inadequate mitigation measures in place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7298  Respondent: 8839233 / Ruth Archer  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

NPPF

- The National Planning Policy Framework appears to have been completely ignored in this case. NPPF1 ‘provides a framework within which local people and their parish councils can produce their own distinctive local and neighbourhood plans reflecting the needs and priorities of their communities’. NPPF 155 states ‘early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods and local organisations is essential’. There was NO prior collaboration or discussion with the local community before the revised Local Plan was published. We have not been given the opportunity to express the needs and priorities of our two separate communities (Normandy & Flexford). The first local residents knew about the proposals for 1100 dwellings at A46 was when the recent proposed local plan was published by GBC.
- The raison d’etre for green belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land protected from development. ‘The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence’ (NPPF). GBC are ignoring this fact and completely disregarding the view of open fields from the Hogs Back which is part of the Surrey Hills AONB.
Another purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another. Urban development at A46 would bring the towns of Guildford and the conurbation of Ash/Ash Vale/Aldershot/Farnborough much closer together. The planning applications recently submitted by private developers to build numerous dwellings at Merrist Wood, Fairlands and Wood Street combined with the urban development of A46 would result in an uncontained urban sprawl from Guildford to Ash.

Secondary School

- There is no convincing evidence to support the proposal that a new secondary school is required in Normandy to meet the educational needs of West Guildford. The birth rate in Guildford is currently falling, partly due to the high cost of housing which is forcing young families to move away from the Guildford area to find affordable homes. This includes our son & daughter in law and several of their friends.
- Kings College in Park Barn, West Guildford and Ash Manor School in Ash are currently undersubscribed and have hundreds of vacant places available for secondary school students. Both schools have offered to increase their intake if necessary to accommodate more pupils.
- Guildford County School on the A31 has recently had expansion plans approved which will create more places in a secondary school on the west side of Guildford within easy walking distance of Guildford Station.
- The Land Availability Assessment projections reveal no identified need for a secondary school during the first five years of the proposed house building programme. A private application for a five form entry secondary school has already been submitted recently as part of a proposed housing development at Rokers in Worplesdon.
- If it should somehow be proven that a new secondary school is required in West Guildford, the Blackwell Farm site would have much better infrastructure to cope with the large amount of extra traffic a secondary school would generate and it would be much better placed to serve West Guildford.
- Rushmoor Borough Council is proposing to build more schools in Aldershot which will serve the Ash & Tongham communities if required, so there is no need for a new secondary school in Normandy to serve those communities.

Highways & Infrastructure

- The proposal to build 1100 dwellings would result in a further 1,375 passenger vehicles (at 1.25 per household as per ONS). The Local Plan proposal doubles the size of the village in one housing development which will have a major impact on the highways and infrastructure.
- No account appears to have taken of the severe inadequacy of the infrastructure in Normandy & Flexford to cope with the increased traffic which would result from the proposed development. There appear to be no plans to improve the infrastructure.
- The communities of Normandy and Flexford are served to the west by a lane classified as C16 (Westwood Lane) which has a narrow low bridge and single lane traffic under the bridge. Large lorries cannot fit under the bridge and traffic queues build up during peak time as drivers wait their turn to use the single lane under the bridge. The communities are served to the east by a D60 lane (Glaziers Lane unclassified) which has a structurally weak bridge crossing the railway line at Wanborough Station. The sightlines for drivers crossing the bridge are very poor and the bend at the top of the bridge results in regular near misses between cars travelling in opposite directions. The bridge was not built to cope with lorries which results in lorries regularly ‘bottoming’ as they cross the bridge and further weakening it’s structure. The Westwood Lane bridge is inaccessible for double decker buses which are the general mode of transport provided to get children to and from school and also used for school trips etc.
- Exiting the A31 westbound to reach Normandy & Flexford (a popular route from Guildford) requires a right turn on to the B3000 at the top of Puttenham Hill with very limited visibility to the left and a blind bend to the right. There are no traffic lights to assist this manoeuvre. There are frequent minor road traffic accidents and near misses at this junction which will inevitably increase if more traffic is accessing Normandy and Flexford.
- At peak times there is always severe traffic congestion on the A31 & the A323 (the only two routes linking Normandy & Flexford with other towns) and also at the junctions with Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane. There are no traffic lights to assist drivers wishing to join the A323. The traffic congestion will intensify if 1100 dwellings and a secondary school are built at A46.
- An independent assessment suggests that if the proposal for A46 is implemented there will be an average of an extra 800 traffic movements every hour on roads which weren’t built to cope with this volume of traffic.
• Wanborough Railway Station has no access to the Guildford platform for the mobility impaired. The station has no staff to provide assistance to passengers and only one ticket machine which can result in long queues to purchase tickets during peak times. When the one ticket machine is broken, passengers have to persuade the guard on the train to issue them with a ticket which train guards are increasingly reticent to do suspecting fraud. This puts passengers from Wanborough in a very difficult position.

Flood Risk

• Whenever there is heavy rain, the eastbound A31 access road floods at the top of Wanborough Hill. Cars exiting the A31 eastbound emerge from a sharp bend, find themselves facing a large lake on their side of the road and immediately have to drive on the opposite side of the road to avoid planeing. This creates a serious traffic hazard for drivers approaching the A31 slip road eastbound from both Puttenham Hill and Wanborough Hill. This will worsen if the volumes of traffic into Normandy and Flexford increase due to the proposed housing development

• Heavy rain regularly results in flooding in West Flexford Lane & Flexford Road which results in sewage floating in the roads

• Heavy rain also causes flooding in Glaziers Lane near the junction with the A323 also resulting in sewage floating in the road and there is regular flooding in Glaziers Lane to the east of Walden Copse

• The proposed large housing development will considerably increase the amount of rainfall run off which will greatly exacerbate the flooding issues around the area.

• The clay soil on which Normandy and Flexford are built also exacerbates flooding problems. Just to the south of the Flexford and Normandy communities is the geological line where clay meets chalk which results in many water springs emerging above ground in the hamlet of Wanborough and flowing north through Flexford and Normandy. Once the clay soil has reached water storage capacity, the groundwater has nowhere to go so the result is flooding.

• GBC’s Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) has excluded the land north of land A46. Loss of area 3b to development when this currently acts as a floodplain will considerably impact the surrounding area which GBC has identified as an area at risk of flooding in it’s SWMP

Environmental Concerns

• There is wide biodiversity in and around area A46. We regularly see hedgehogs, newts, skylarks, toads, lizards, grazing deer, grass snakes & the occasional adder in the vicinity. Fragmentation of habitat will result in declining biodiversity exacerbated by the inevitable increase in the number of cats and dogs living in the area as a result of the proposed housing development.

• Another contributory factor will be the inevitable increase in litter pollution caused by the presence of a large number of households and particularly by a new secondary school in the locality

• Light pollution will increase and the dark corridor between Guildford and Ash will be lost which will make hunting food sources increasingly difficult for nocturnal wildlife

• The habitat within and adjoining A46 are priority habitats under the NERC Act and GBC has appeared to ignore this legal obligation in the A46 proposal

• Policy D4 states: ‘new development within inset villages will have particular regard to important views of the village from the surrounding landscape.’ The urbanisation of A46 will impact considerably on the views of Normandy and Flexford from the Surrey Hills AONB during daylight hours and increase light pollution during the hours of darkness

Health Issues

• The potential combination of major site work at A46 and the proposed A3 road improvements would have a severe impact on Normandy and Flexford’s lanes classified as C16 and D60. Multiple journeys by construction traffic and the constant noise and pollution generated would be harmful to the physical and psychological health of residents living in the vicinity, many of whom are elderly. Planning policy appears to have ignored the location of the site and failed to assess the traffic impact on a semi rural community

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
NPPF

• The National Planning Policy Framework appears to have been completely ignored in this case. NPPF1 ‘provides a framework within which local people and their parish councils can produce their own distinctive local and neighbourhood plans reflecting the needs and priorities of their communities’. NPPF 155 states ‘early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods and local organisations is essential’. There was NO prior collaboration or discussion with the local community before the revised Local Plan was published. We have not been given the opportunity to express the needs and priorities of our two separate communities (Normandy & Flexford). The first local residents knew about the proposals for 1100 dwellings at A46 was when the recent proposed local plan was published by GBC.
• The raison d’etre for green belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land protected from development. ‘The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence’ (NPPF). GBC are ignoring this fact and completely disregarding the view of open fields from the Hogs Back which is part of the Surrey Hills AONB.
• Another purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another. Urban development at A46 would bring the towns of Guildford and the conurbation of Ash/Ash Vale/Aldershot/Farnborough much closer together. The planning applications recently submitted by private developers to build numerous dwellings at Merrist Wood, Fairlands and Wood Street combined with the urban development of A46 would result in an uncontrolled urban sprawl from Guildford to Ash

Secondary School

• There is no convincing evidence to support the proposal that a new secondary school is required in Normandy to meet the educational needs of West Guildford. The birth rate in Guildford is currently falling, partly due to the high cost of housing which is forcing young families to move away from the Guildford area to find affordable homes. This includes our son & daughter in law and several of their friends.
• Kings College in Park Barn, West Guildford and Ash Manor School in Ash are currently undersubscribed and have hundreds of vacant places available for secondary school students. Both schools have offered to increase their intake if necessary to accommodate more pupils.
• Guildford County School on the A31 has recently had expansion plans approved which will create more places in a secondary school on the west side of Guildford within easy walking distance of Guildford Station.
• The Land Availability Assessment projections reveal no identified need for a secondary school during the first five years of the proposed house building programme. A private application for a five form entry secondary school has already been submitted recently as part of a proposed housing development at Rokers in Worplesdon.
• If it should somehow be proven that a new secondary school is required in West Guildford, the Blackwell Farm site would have much better infrastructure to cope with the large amount of extra traffic a secondary school would generate and it would be much better placed to serve West Guildford.
• Rushmoor Borough Council is proposing to build more schools in Aldershot which will serve the Ash & Tongham communities if required, so there is no need for a new secondary school in Normandy to serve those communities.
Highways & Infrastructure

- The proposal to build 1100 dwellings would result in a further 1,375 passenger vehicles (at 1.25 per household as per ONS). The Local Plan proposal doubles the size of the village in one housing development which will have a major impact on the highways and infrastructure.
- No account appears to have taken of the severe inadequacy of the infrastructure in Normandy & Flexford to cope with the increased traffic which would result from the proposed development. There appear to be no plans to improve the infrastructure.
- The communities of Normandy and Flexford are served to the west by a lane classified as C16 (Westwood Lane) which has a narrow low bridge and single lane traffic under the bridge. Large lorries cannot fit under the bridge and traffic queues build up during peak time as drivers wait their turn to use the single lane under the bridge. The communities are served to the east by a D60 lane (Glaziers Lane unclassified) which has a structurally weak bridge crossing the railway line at Wanborough Station. The sightlines for drivers crossing the bridge are very poor and the bend at the top of the bridge results in regular near misses between cars travelling in opposite directions. The bridge was not built to cope with lorries which results in lorries regularly ‘bottoming’ as they cross the bridge and further weakening it’s structure. The Westwood Lane bridge is inaccessible for double decker buses which are the general mode of transport provided to get children to and from school and also used for school trips etc.
- Exiting the A31 westbound to reach Normandy & Flexford (a popular route from Guildford) requires a right turn on to the B3000 at the top of Puttenham Hill with very limited visibility to the left and a blind bend to the right. There are no traffic lights to assist this manoeuvre. There are frequent minor road traffic accidents and near misses at this junction which will inevitably increase if more traffic is accessing Normandy and Flexford.
- At peak times there is always severe traffic congestion on the A31 & the A323 (the only two routes linking Normandy & Flexford with other towns) and also at the junctions with Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane. There are no traffic lights to assist drivers wishing to join the A323. The traffic congestion will intensify if 1100 dwellings and a secondary school are built at A46
- An independent assessment suggests that if the proposal for A46 is implemented there will be an average of an extra 800 traffic movements every hour on roads which weren’t built to cope with this volume of traffic.
- Wanborough Railway Station has no access to the Guildford platform for the mobility impaired. The station has no staff to provide assistance to passengers and only one ticket machine which can result in long queues to purchase tickets during peak times. When the one ticket machine is broken, passengers have to persuade the guard on the train to issue them with a ticket which train guards are increasingly reticent to do suspecting fraud. This puts passengers from Wanborough in a very difficult position.

Environmental Concerns

- There is wide biodiversity in and around area A46. We regularly see hedgehogs, newts, skylarks, toads, lizards, grazing deer, grass snakes & the occasional adder in the vicinity. Fragmentation of habitat will result in declining biodiversity exacerbated by the inevitable increase in the number of cats and dogs living in the area as a result of the proposed housing development.
- Another contributory factor will be the inevitable increase in litter pollution caused by the presence of a large number of households and particularly by a new secondary school in the locality
- Light pollution will increase and the dark corridor between Guildford and Ash will be lost which will make hunting food sources increasingly difficult for nocturnal wildlife
- The habitat within and adjoining A46 are priority habitats under the NERC Act and GBC has appeared to ignore this legal obligation in the A46 proposal
Policy D4 states: ‘new development within inset villages will have particular regard to important views of the village from the surrounding landscape.’ The urbanisation of A46 will impact considerably on the views of Normandy and Flexford from the Surrey Hills AONB during daylight hours and increase light pollution during the hours of darkness

**Flood Risk**

- Whenever there is heavy rain, the eastbound A31 access road floods at the top of Wanborough Hill. Cars exiting the A31 eastbound emerge from a sharp bend, find themselves facing a large lake on their side of the road and immediately have to drive on the opposite side of the road to avoid planeing. This creates a serious traffic hazard for drivers approaching the A31 slip road eastbound from both Puttenham Hill and Wanborough Hill. This will worsen if the volumes of traffic into Normandy and Flexford increase due to the proposed housing development
- Heavy rain regularly results in flooding in West Flexford Lane & Flexford Road which results in sewage floating in the roads
- Heavy rain also causes flooding in Glaziers Lane near the junction with the A323 also resulting in sewage floating in the road and there is regular flooding in Glaziers Lane to the east of Walden Copse
- The proposed large housing development will considerably increase the amount of rainfall run off which will greatly exacerbate the flooding issues around the area.
- The clay soil on which Normandy and Flexford are built also exacerbates flooding problems. Just to the south of the Flexford and Normandy communities is the geological line where clay meets chalk which results in many water springs emerging above ground in the hamlet of Wanborough and flowing north through Flexford and Normandy. Once the clay soil has reached water storage capacity, the groundwater has nowhere to go so the result is flooding.
- GBC’s Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) has excluded the land north of land A46. Loss of area 3b to development when this currently acts as a floodplain will considerably impact the surrounding area which GBC has identified as an area at risk of flooding in it’s SWMP

**Health Issues**

- The potential combination of major site work at A46 and the proposed A3 road improvements would have a severe impact on Normandy and Flexford’s lanes classified as C16 and D60. Multiple journeys by construction traffic and the constant noise and pollution generated would be harmful to the physical and psychological health of residents living in the vicinity, many of whom are elderly. Planning policy appears to have ignored the location of the site and failed to assess the traffic impact on a semi rural community

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6603  **Respondent:** 8839425 / Julia Hall  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the Guildford Borough Council New Draft of the Local Plan 2016 for the following reasons:

1. The development is huge, in fact more like another village/large housing estate than an integral part of the current village.
1. The proposal for a new school which could only be justified by the development of the land is not a valid argument. The case for a school without the housing development is also unproven with spare places at most of the local secondary schools and capacity to enlarge should the need arise and therefore to justify the plan for a school because of the new housing development is totally unacceptable and nonsensical.

1. The proposed land is in the Green Belt and no exceptional circumstance has been proved to justify its development or removal from the Green Belt.

1. The roads around the site are already overloaded with traffic and as hundreds of people on this side of Guildford are aware, the Hogs Back (A31) at Puttenham is almost impossible to join in the rush hour with queueing traffic every morning trying to join the A3. The A323 is also a major problem with major congestion.

1. There are many other sites with much easier access to the A3, a major trunk route in and out of London, which would be far more suitable for a development of this nature.

1. If this development were to go ahead, it would have a knock-on detrimental effect on Wanborough and Puttenham as well as other surrounding villages.

1. Although some development is inevitable, this is a semi-rural village in Surrey with only a small buffer left between Ash and Normandy due to the large scale development which has been allowed in Ash.

1. There is a large amount of wildlife in the area which is gradually diminishing but would be severely impacted by a development of this size.

1. I would like to question why certain villages and sites have been removed from potential development in the Local Plan but Normandy has now become a prime target.

1. The fact that a large property developer is involved in this plan is extremely concerning and severely diminishes the moral aspect of this proposal.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
We wish to object most strongly to your plan to remove this historic, arable pasture-land from the protection of the Green Belt and replace it with a 1,500 pupil secondary school plus 1,100 homes.

Our particular objections are as follows:

1) Normandy has a unique landscape which should be preserved for future generations. It consists of a patchwork of small hamlets and Green Belt fields, surrounded by ancient woodland. The precious Green Belt should not be sacrificed for a huge urban development.

2) It has not been proved that there is any necessity for an additional secondary school in the area.

3) This entire area is prone to serious floodplain, both during heavy rainfall and throughout the year. A series of underground streams drain down from the Hogsback to the land at site A46. It is virtually a flood plain.

4) There is absolutely no way that the present infrastructure could support this vast increase in housing. Sewage and drainage facilities are totally inadequate and out-dated.

5) The local roads are narrow, dangerous and mostly unlit. They are already heavily congested and used as 'rat-runs' during peak times. There are few safe pavements. Additional traffic from Rushmoor's massive housing expansion will further add to the problems here. Dark winter nights; heavy fast-moving traffic; cyclists and school children on the lanes; surely a recipe for disaster!

6) The A46 proposed site lies within the 5km boundary of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. It therefore poses a significant threat to the rare species breeding grounds. It would also have a devastating effect upon the precious wildlife within the A46 site itself and the surrounding rural area.

7) The view of this huge urban development from the Surrey Hills Area of outstanding natural beauty, both day and night, would literally be a massive "blot on the landscape".

Central Government have consistently stated: - "We will always protect the Green Belt and make sure planning decisions are made by local people"

Therefore, we are appealing to you to do the right thing and protect Normandy's Green Belt status in perpetuity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
It is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, and therefore any development is subject to EU/UK legislation (NPPF 119). The impact cannot be mitigated with SANGs because there is no evidence base to support SANGs as required by NRM6 viii, NPPF 158 and 166.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6198  Respondent: 8857025 / Martin Sweeting  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Objection to the development A46 Normandy & Flexford 'strategic site'

I wish to register my strongest possible objection to the draft plan to build ~1100 houses and a secondary school on the A46 Normandy & Flexford 'strategic site' for the following reasons:

- The A46 site lies within the Green Belt and has been assessed by the Council as having a high sensitivity in Green Belt terms. The exceptional circumstances required by Government before Green Belt land can be released have not been demonstrated.
- The proposal for a school on the A46 site is largely justified by the associated housing development. The housing is only put forward on the basis of the school, and the school on the basis of the housing – this is a circular argument. This cannot amount to an exceptional circumstance for the release of land from the Green Belt. Furthermore, the local pupil population requirement has not been justified and indeed is not supported by independent data provided to the Council by schools in the area. Thus a proper justification for the location of a secondary school in Normandy has not been made and indeed the proposed site plan would not result in a sustainable development.
- The traffic movements resulting from the proposed development would have a catastrophic effect on an already overloaded road infrastructure. Glaziers Lane (D60) and Westwood Lane (C16) are narrow minor roads severely restricted by railway bridges and access to the already congested A31 is completely inadequate.
- The area suffers from regular flooding and the A46 site contributes to the natural drainage of the area. No credible plans have been offered to address the severe impact regarding flooding of the proposed housing/school development on the site.
- The proposed development will have a seriously detrimental effect on the local environment and wildlife associated with the A46 site – red kites, owls, bats, deer, badgers, hedgehogs, nightingales and slow worms.

The proposed development would destroy the present distinct village communities of Normandy and Flexford that contribute to the general openness of the area, the enjoyment of Guildford residents and attract businesses.

It is clear that this development proposal is commercially motivated by the property developer rather than based upon an objective analysis of the requirements of and impact upon the local community.

This proposal does not meet the exceptional circumstances required by government to remove land classified as Green Belt and should be firmly rejected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6357  Respondent: 8857921 / Duncan Ford  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46
I am writing to object to the proposal to build 1,100 new houses and a secondary school for 1,500 pupils on land between Normandy and Flexford.

The area of land recommended for this huge development is Green Belt land of 'red sensitivity'. This means it is totally unsuitable for development, especially on this scale. The area is not just grassland, it is classed as arable and pastoral land.

The suggested reason for overlooking the red sensitivity of the site, is educational needs - that a new school is needed west of Guildford. However this is not the case as the existing schools nearby, such as Kings College and Ash Manor, have provision for plenty of extra pupils. So a new school (and new shops) would only be needed if 1,100 extra houses were built.

There are brown belt sites in and around Guildford town centre which should be developed before any Green Belt. I understand that GBC has to find sites for new housing, but these should be spread out across the Borough, not just a few massive sites as recommended by big property developers like Taylor Wimpey purely for commercial reasons.

To conclude, the Local Plan doesn't demonstrate the 'exceptional circumstances' needed to remove the Green Belt status of this site between Normandy and Flexford. The proposed development should therefore not go ahead.

I object to policy A46 land to the south of Normandy

There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints

There is unproven demand for secondary school places in the west wards that is being proposed as "exceptional circumstances" to redraw the Green Belt boundary. There is strong research evidence from SCC Education which proves existing under-utilisation in long term of secondary places in the west of the borough.

There is an incorrect calculation of bespoke SANG since only 10 ha are proposed within site but the new population requires 21 ha. This will impact viability if contained in site (65 ha approx) - there is not an additional 10 ha in currently proposed SANG pre-allocated schedule in infrastructure report (Russell Place Farm)

There is an incorrect evaluation of contribution of land within and between settlements to Green Belt "openness" -the previous PINS decisions in three appeals asserts "openness". GBC state there is no "openness" yet all land parcels in the site are 'red' sensitivity in GBCS Vol 2 Addendum 1 & 2 and all contribute to the 3 key purposes of the Green Belt.

There is a failure to engage with Rushmoor under the duty to co-operate rules in regards of traffic impact from Aldershot Urban Extension (3,800 homes) The increased commuting to Guildford plus new local vehicles (1,375 estimated) will take the A323 to over design capacity and produce perpetual congestion

The one railway bridge in Glaziers Lane + 1 railway tunnel in Westwood Lane on North Downs line are restricted (tunnel single lane) with poor geometry and have poor safety records with one fatality in last 15 years and there is no plan in the
infrastructure report to widen bridge or replace tunnel (Network Rail). This will lock traffic from new development within site to the north of Flexford. C and D class roads are not designed for volumes indicated in Scenario 5.

The flood risk will be significantly increased when land is developed. The site lies on the Hogs Back spring line and the land is natural SuDS. There is a stream running through the site with flood risk 3a. Civil engineering mitigation is unlikely to be effective.

The site will introduce 300+ dogs and 250+ cats within 1km of TBHSPA and SANG will not stop increased disturbance and predation on the SPA.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6876  Respondent: 8859233 / David Mair  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We would like to object to the development of green belt land to the south of Normandy and the north of Flexford.

1. The surrounding roads are not suitable and cannot be made suitable for the amount of additional traffic this amount of housing would generate ( bearing in mind GBC cannot up keep the existing local roads to a suitable level).
2. There is no justification to build a new secondary school in the area as it has been proven that all of the local secondary schools are under subscribed, some massively.
3. The Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area is very close to the proposed site. Other single dwelling applications have been refused.
4. This is green belt land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7001  Respondent: 8859329 / Katie Aaronson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (“Local Plan”); in particular I would like to emphasise my objection to the plans to substantially develop land at the north of Flexford and south of Normandy (policy A46).

The proposed development of said site would have significant negative impacts on my home village of Normandy and on the local community, and there is no justification for this in the Local Plan or its supporting documents. It would likely more than double the population and fundamentally change the identity of the place from village to a continuation of Guildford’s urban sprawl.

My key objection to the development of this site is that it is within the Green Belt, and a particularly important piece of Green Belt which protects an area of beautiful, open countryside by preventing the settlements from merging into each
other. The village has ancient woodland and grassland within its boundaries, supporting an important diversity of wildlife and plants. Development of this scale risks destroying vital ‘green corridors’ needed by animals, but also damaging various rare species. I can remember to this day learning in geography lessons that the Green Belt is precious and to be protected. I am astounded that this invaluable piece of natural capital is even being considered for destruction.

The fact that this area is just 1km from the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area further strengthens my objection. Normandy Common and Normandy Pond are also designated as SNCI areas. Conserving the area ear-marked for development is also critical to protecting other areas of enormous environmental importance.

Aside from my fundamental objection to developing crucial Green Belt land, I also believe that developing this site is nonsensical in practical terms. Normandy does not have the infrastructure to support significant development on this site, both in terms of road and rail links (which are already under strain), parking, and the provision of basic services such as electricity and sewerage. There has not been a proper assessment of the impacts of this proposal on the surrounding roads, which cannot cope with a scale up of this size. Wanborough Station is served by an infrequent and often unreliable service, and the station is not accessible for the disabled. There is no indication in the Local Plan that the improvements which would be necessary to cope with this are possible within the timeframe it covers.

GBC’s Local Plan consultation operated on the basis that policy A46 would be deleted if the location of a secondary school on the site could not be justified. There is no proper justification for a new secondary school in the village, nor for locating it on Green Belt land. The site seems to have been selected on the basis it would be close to new housing, but this is therefore a completely flawed and circular argument. The proposed housing is dependent on the school, and vice versa. This does not qualify as an ‘exceptional circumstance’ which would justify building on the Green Belt.

I also object to the way in which the Local Plan has been made, which calls into question its legality. It lacks solid evidence and is not based on a careful analysis of how it will impact the environment. There is nothing on the Local Plan / supporting documents to demonstrate the ‘exceptional circumstances’ (NPPF, 80) which would justify removal of the site from the Green Belt. The Sustainability Appraisal fails to explain why this development would be justified on environmental grounds, or to demonstrate what the ‘exceptional circumstances’ are. In contrast it recognises that developing sites like this has greater impacts on the Green Belt (see footnote 68, p.131) – highlighting the greater environmental cost of such a development, but entirely failing to explain on what grounds this is justifiable.

As the school location has not been justified, and for the other reasons I have outlined above, GBC should confirm that they will delete policy A46 from the Local Plan, preserving this precious piece of Green Belt.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I Object to the vast numbers of homes boxed in by a single lane, height limited railway arch on Westwood Lane (classified C16) with a difficult junction on to the A323, and Glaziers Lane (unclassified).

I Object to the increased traffic from the homes proposed, and a huge secondary school with daily drop offs and pick-ups would result in our local roads and ‘A’ routes grinding to a halt at peak times with massively increased exhaust pollution of NoX and CO2 threatening the health of our old people and children.

I Object to GBC are ignoring past verdicts of planning inspectors that our green fields contribute to the ‘openness’ of the Green Belt and panoramic view of our green fields to the Surrey Hills AONB.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3853  Respondent: 8859969 / Jez Phoenix  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing this email to object to the proposed development of A46 Normandy & Flexford ‘Strategic Site’.

There are a lot reasons for not building the 1,100 houses, secondary school and six travelling showpeople pitches with yards. A number of which, I am sure, have been already mentioned:

- A46 was not proposed or considered as a strategic site in the first consultation
- A46 fails national planning policy framework
- ‘Sustainability’ versus ‘Sensitivity’
- Unsubstantiated claims by GBC that ignore the rights of locals to live in a rural environment
- Threat to the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area
- Traffic Chaos
- Etc.

However, I would like to present my own option of how the area of Normandy and Flexford will be affected. I have lived in the area for nearly 10 years and it is a lovely place to be a part of and to raise a family in. It is an area of outstanding natural beauty. My wife and I regularly walk around the area between Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane with our 3 children. It is a small area of Surrey that is a habitat for all kinds of different species and we all love seeing this nature on our door step:

Please don’t destroy it. We should be protecting these areas for our future generations.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  Phoenix.jpg (39 KB)  Woodland.png (1.3 MB)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1185  Respondent: 8862657 / Angela Wright  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
The local plan site A46 which was not proposed or considered as a strategic site in the first consultation.

I OBJECT to the disproportionate scale of the proposed new development in Normandy.

It will destroy large areas of high quality GREEN BELT land. It will have a devastating visual impact on the surrounding open countryside and threaten the character and tranquility of the village and our rural environment. It is important that such areas are preserved.

This large scale development will have a massive impact and cause huge increases in traffic on the C and D class roads in the village which are wholly inadequate for the amount of traffic and congestion this will generate.

There is no proven need for a secondary school to be sited in Normandy as other schools in the area are under subscribed by 736 places and there are approved expansions at two other secondary schools.

There are many established traveller and gypsy sites in the village which are sufficient to satisfy the Borough's legal obligation. Normandy has the highest pitch density per household of all the parishes whilst others have none. GBC position was to spread the requirement for such pitches across the borough and not allow concentration in one parish so I see no reason why Normandy should be targeted for more sites.

Development on this scale will double the size of the village and undoubtedly remove the rural character of the village. This will also put stress on existing infrastructure for water and other services. There are local problems with flooding and drainage which will be made worse.

Before building on open fields which is destructive and environmentally unacceptable more emphasis should be given to how Brownfield sites can be regenerated and unused commercial spaces can be utilised as an alternative housing solution. Also other alternatives could be looked at. If the University of Surrey built promised student accommodation on site it would make hundreds of homes in Guildford available to help meet the housing shortage.

We need to protect our countryside and not allow developers under the guise of need to profit from the erosion of GREEN BELT. The Government promised "to protect the green belt and make sure planning decisions are made by local people"

I OBJECT to the development for site A46

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The C road has a narrow railway bridge over it. The D road contains one that is not in a good state of repair. All the extra traffic will not help the situation.

The junction on the Guildford to Aldershot road are not easy at the best of time, This main road cannot cope with the rush hour traffic until long queues forming.

A new secondary school will make the traffic problem almost impossible with parents dropping off and collecting pupils. This proposed building is not necessary as none of the local schools are full. King Mana is currently running at 52%!

We are not unreasonable people in Normandy and would be happy to have unfilling or small development that will not cause so many problems,

I trust that you and the planning committees will do right by this village and not impose such a large development on us causing so many problems.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2733  Respondent: 8875713 / John Baker  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to air my grievance at the proposed development in Normandy. I have been visiting the area and appreciate the quintessential qualities of an English village set in the Surrey Hills. The high school development along with 1500 units of housing plus a row of retail outlets would destroyed this.

And what about the environmental impact upon wildlife. Those fields are home to dear, rabbit, grass snakes, hedgehogs, woodpeckers, and many more dangers. I have been making good use of walking in those fields and have come to appreciate how much significance it plays upon the quality of life for people in the area to be able to have such open spaces available.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/501  Respondent: 8876321 / Josephine Holliday  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

To put no finer point on the above but to say I OBJECT to the above on the following points:

Nobody from Guildford Borough Council (GBC) has ever contacted in any shape or form the residents of Normandy to ask their opinion of what they feel is their rights as locals living in the area and how their lives will be totally changed – for the worse. Why? That is not democratic.

We do not require any school either primary or secondary and there are so many places still available in all local schools and they even have enlargement facilities if required. Now Brexit is upon us this will totally change on migration,
enlargement of families and financial requirements of businesses and councils and property developers, and the restraints that perhaps will ensue could last for years. It is not cheap to pay for schools that are not required and waste our taxes.

We also do not require (obviously Cllr Spooner does not live in Normandy or Flexford) any shops or pubs. These are not frequented enough to make them a viable proposition for any owner. We have had these in the past and they have gone out of business through lack of customers. Nearly everybody has a car and goes to a local supermarket and if they do not, they either have items delivered directly to home or neighbours assist. We have not had a shop of pub for years and everybody is getting on with life extremely well. The Royal Oak and White Hart are only minutes away and gone are the days of frequenting pubs daily. They are now more used to eat in.

There are plenty of brownfield sites already with services provided that a smaller developer could build upon.

We also do not require any more showman pitches as I feel Normandy has all the traveller sites for GBC.

Housing is required in Guildford town centre and the University campus.

The council have used Normandy and Flexford as one area when it suits them and two areas again when more advantageous results are required. You cannot do this – is it even legal?

Residents now cannot concrete their front drives how on earth can the council justify concreting a complete field. Normandy is used by dog walkers, ramblers, cyclists, leisure and competitions, horse riders and tourist to Guildford. With what the council propose no tourist will have these pleasures.

Normandy is the countryside for Guildford for people to come and enjoy and relax and although I agree some housing is required in smaller pockets I do not agree that a “Milton Keynes” needs to be built doubling the footfall, the terrible congestion on both Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane, the air quality, the noise level, the services overload, the loss of agriculture, fauna, animal and insect habitation, the peaceful and quiet lifestyle that is my human right. The lack of places at the local doctors surgeries that is now running at over two weeks for an appointment. The threat to the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area, the risk of flooding, the lack of consideration of the countryside view of urbanisation near the Surrey Hills.

Finally, I hope that Taylor Wimpey and GBC are not negotiating a Section 106 Agreement which is a way which makes a development proposal acceptable in planning terms that would otherwise not be acceptable – just for the sake of money at the detriment of those living in Normandy as this would make it morally illegal.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2783</th>
<th>Respondent: 8877697 / Moira Newman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</td>
<td>Is Sound? ( )</td>
<td>Is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I wish to express my views as to the local plan regarding Normandy.

I am in complete agreement with the removal of sites A46 and A47, as these have very poor access and one interferes with a public footpath which would be hemmed in instead of being open, a space accessible to those who live in the area, providing a place for well being and walking, the open air and an area away from traffic.

A47 is an area which is liable to flooding having a stream from Flexford running through it and in some winters, the area has been under 3ft of water. Access is also limited and narrow.
These two sites would exacerbate the amount of traffic in these narrow lanes, detrimental to health and local wildlife.

I see that a part of Normandy has been [illegible word] from the Green Belt, including homes in Guildford Rd, the northern end of Glaziers Lane, Flexford, Walden Cottages and Palm House Nurseries.

None of these places is suitable for housing. The access is small, [illegible word] too narrow and the whole [illegible word] become a place of traffic pollution, another green lung taken out of the surrounding area of Guildford.

The infrastructure required to make this work and the traffic to flow is not very feasible in this area as the only real [illegible word] road is the A3 which already is overloaded at rush hour times and can cause great problems when accidents occur. The A31 fares no better. From Normandy one can see the traffic [illegible word] to tail along its length and this would be made even worse.

No doubt the homes built would lack anywhere other thats the drive to park the car and children have nowhere to play in a garden. All most homes seem to have these days is the minimum of a square of grass at the rear of the property.

All in all this area is not conducive to such a large number of homes being built as the infrastructure, just is not there to take the additional volume of traffic. I therefore object to this Local Plan, as it will also affect the “openness of the Green Belt.” The Green Belt is there as a safety net that we may all enjoy some open space in our surroundings. It should not be reduced of “whittled away”.

The place to build is on brownfield sites and these must be identified and used instead of denying the surrounding area its “green lungs” for the enjoyment of all residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough. With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become even more biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11,350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 or 4 miles of Ripley, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3814  Respondent: 8883905 / Sarah Irving  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am objecting for the following reasons.

• The land is Green Belt and should be protected, not built. It is the home to a multitude of flora and fauna and an essential "green corridor" which connects or lies close to other protected areas close by, such as Wanborough and Normandy Woods Site of Nature Conservation and The Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. Only last week, I was walking across A46 in the late evening and saw a stag beetle clumsily flying in front of me and heard baby owls screeching in the woods. Where will these creatures go once their habitat has been destroyed and the land covered with concrete?

• Guildford Borough Council has cited the need for a new seven form entry secondary school in the west of the borough as the "exceptional circumstance" that allows this land (A46) to be removed from the Green Belt, but the case for such a new school has not been Guildford County School and St Peter's are both expanding. King's College is more than 50% undersubscribed and desperate for pupils. Ash Manor and King's College are both able and willing to build extra classrooms on their sites. In addition, in 2014, Surrey County Council proposed that '...site within the proposed urban extension at Blackwell Farm, with all necessary access infrastructure built in and a catchment surrounding the site, would be a more sustainable location in transport terms for a new secondary school to serve the western side of Guildford.' Given SCC's advice, the under subscription of neighbouring schools and the potential for growth in these already established schools, why has GBC ignored all the evidence? Perhaps it is because it is easier to manage a few large scale developments across the county than many small ones, and so GBC has decided to dump one of its large developments in Normandy at the last moment (and without prior consultation of the residents of Normandy) and use the supposed need for a school to support its ill thought through proposals.

• The proposed developments of A46 and A47 are bounded by rural roads and a railway: Glazier's Lane is an unclassified road, Westwood Lane is a C-class road and both of these have dangerous junctions with Guildford. In addition, there is a dangerous hump back bridge over the railway on Glazier's Lane and a one lane Railway tunnel on Westwood Lane, both of which have impaired visibility. I live in Beech Lane and turning left out of it (to go under the railway bridge) is always difficult to do safely because the "kink" in the road does not give you a clear view of what is the other side of the bridge. With the increased traffic that will result from the proposed development there will inevitably be more road traffic accidents. There will also be more traffic jams and commuters having to wait in traffic. During rush hours, the traffic backs up along both Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane where they meet the Guildford road and this would increase and cause more congestion if there was a large housing development in Normandy.

• Normandy is prone to flooding as it is very low lying and because the underlying soil structure does not drain. For instance, the fields in A46 backing onto the railway line can become covered in a misty fog after heavy rain, showing just how sodden the land there is, and Wanborough Station floods so badly that passengers cannot get to it without wading through water up to their knees. I building over the land on A46 would exacerbate these and other flooding problems in the village.
The development of A46 is developer-led, with the developer making huge profits out of the destruction of the Green Belt. Where is the due process of town and country planning in this? I completely understand that new housing is required in the borough but believe it should be more fairly spread out amongst all the parishes. I **reiterate that I strongly object to large scale development in Normandy and Flexford.**

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2849  **Respondent:** 8883905 / Sarah Irving  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I support the removal of site A46, land between Glazier’s Lane and Westwood Lane in Normandy, which was earmarked, in my opinion, for a totally unsuitable development of 1000 plus homes and a unneeded secondary school.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2248  **Respondent:** 8884225 / Ken Marchant  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Further to my previous comments, I strongly object to the proposal policy of building some 1000 houses and a 1,500 place secondary school on the Green Belt land between Normandy and Flexford for the following reasons:

1. It would totally destroy the rural environment of both villages. The sustainability and damage to the environment is certainly not properly assessed in the proposed plan.

2. The justification for a 1,500 place secondary school including where they are coming from, how they are being transported etc etc has not been fully investigated.

3. Traffic is already a major problem on the local village roads and on the A322 and A323, the latter would be totally grid locked at normal rush hour.

4. The plan does not cover who actually requires all these 1000 houses and will they be sufficiently qualified to fill the current availability of jobs in the area of Surrey.

5. The disposal of sewage would almost certainly be a major problem totally overloading the current village fragile system.

6. The area is prone to flooding and has a high water table level particularly in winter.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

---
I wish to object to the proposed development of site A46 in the new local plan on the following grounds:

1. **The proposal for development does not constitute an 'exceptional circumstance' for releasing land from Green Belt.** The proposal goes against the stated duty of GBC to protect Green Belt land. Brownfield site should be used in preference.

2. **The need for a new secondary school, a pivotal argument in consideration of the site, has not been proven.**

   At a meeting of GBC on 24th May, an amendment tabled by Cllr Bilbe and seconded by Paul Spooner (GBC lead), stated that:

   'Site A46 is only included as a strategic site to support provision of a new secondary school and the site should not be developed should it be demonstrated that such a school is not required'.

   Data collected by SCC Cllr Keith Witham demonstrates that a new school is not required.

   Surrounding secondary schools are almost without exception under-subscribed - currently to the tune of 736 vacancies, rising to an estimated 1216 vacancies when the new technical college opens in 2018. Furthermore, existing schools (eg. Ash Manor, Kings College) could be expanded if necessary and SCC has already approved expansion of St Peters and The County School.

   Therefore, the expenditure involved in building, equipping and running another secondary school would seem to be a huge unnecessary waste of public money!

   **Roads and other infrastructure**

   The site is bounded by 2 minor roads. The bridges over (Glaziers Lane) and under (Westwood Lane) the railway already constitute bottlenecks which would be made far worse by the increase in traffic from 1100 dwellings, a nursing home, retail outlets and the proposed schools. The increased traffic would also severely impinge on the junctions at the A323 (Aldershot to Guildford Route) and Wanborough Hill (onto the A31, Hogs Back).

   The area is also subject to flooding and to poor drainage near to the Glaziers Lane/A323 junction. It would be hugely expensive to upgrade the drainage system to cope with such a vast development and flooding would be made worse by the concreting over of a large expanse of land.

   **Effect on Environment and wildlife.**

   The hugely disproportionate development proposed would change the rural nature of Normandy forever. Little regard has been paid to the environmental aspects of sustainability - or to the wishes of local residents.

   The loss of farmland and wildlife habitat would be devastating and the increase in pollution, disturbance from people, and wildlife predation by an estimated 187 cats and 264 dogs would be horrendous. The SANG proposed by the developer would be insufficient to offset the environmental impact of dog walkers, who would probably use local countryside rather than the area provided.

   To conclude, the proposed development of site A46 - a prime Green Belt Site should be removed from the Local Plan.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2294</th>
<th>Respondent: 8887297 / Ian C Milne</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whilst acknowledging the need for housing development within Guildford Borough, I have serious concerns about the extent of development proposed across the borough and in particular I object to the large scale development outlined for Normandy & Flexford.

I would like to register my objections to the Local Plan for the following reasons.

It is essential now and for future generations to protect rural areas from urban sprawl. This is why the Green Belt is valuable to us. The Green Belt of Normandy & Flexford meets all five legal purposes for its existence:

- To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas
- To prevent neighbouring towns merging into each other
- To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- To preserve the setting and special character of historic town
- To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and urban

On this basis the green belt of Normandy, Flexford and Guildford Borough should not be released for large scale development.

As stated in my opening paragraph I acknowledge the need for development in the borough and that some areas will be exempt. However, I do feel very strongly that the hamlets that form Normandy have been allocated a far greater proportion of the boroughs housing requirement than can be justified and that the burden needs to be shared across the borough.

Any development in the village should strive both to maintain the mix of property that currently exists and the needs of first time buyers.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2723</th>
<th>Respondent: 8887297 / Ian C Milne</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would like to register my support of Guildford Borough Council's (GBC) decision to remove site A46 (land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford) and A47 (land to the east of the Paddocks, Flexford) from the 2017 Local Plan.

It is reassuring that GBC has acknowledged that this land is Green Belt and that the infrastructure - roads wastewater, sewage, power supply and healthcare could not support such extensive development. Prior to the development of sites...
remaining in the local plan, it is essential that GBC implement improvements, to ease traffic congestion, such as the new road bridge and footbridge at Ash station to permit removal of the level crossing (ref. LRN21) in advance of building.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1771  Respondent: 8887329 / Sandra Marshall  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to add my objection to the proposed plan for over 1,000 houses and a secondary school to be built in Normandy.

If the plan goes ahead it would result in the doubling of the population of Normandy. The increase in cars for the new residents and general traffic going to and from the school on a twice daily journey would put an unacceptable burden on our local roads.

Westwood Lane is reduced to a single carriage way under the railway bridge with a blind turning from Beech Lane just before the bridge - a sure recipe for accidents.

Glaziers Lane has a narrow hump back bridge crossing the railway which was not built for the kind of heavy traffic that would be a result of the proposed plan.

The junctions of both these roads with the busy Aldershot road are already prone to heavy traffic back up. Normandy crossroads is a renowned accident black spot and the junction at the church is close to Wyke primary school with local families crossing the road to get to school.

In addition Christmispie Crossroad is another accident black spot with regular traffic collisions.

Pollution from the increase in vehicles which will often be slow moving because of traffic build up will be a potential health hazard to the young and elderly in the village.

It is my understanding from recent research that local secondary schools are under subscribed thus eliminating the need to build another.

Lastly some areas of Normandy are prone to flooding. This would surely be increased by the proposed development.

I would have no objection to a SMALL development in Normandy particularly if it was affordable housing to buy or rent.

I hope the above concerns will be considered with care.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7662  Respondent: 8893057 / Dianne Garnett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1.1 **We object** to policy A46 land to the south of Normandy

1.2 There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints

1.3 There is unproven demand for secondary school places in the west wards that is being proposed as "exceptional circumstances" to redraw the Green Belt boundary. There is strong research evidence from SCC Education which proves existing under-utilisation in long term of secondary places in the west of the borough.

1.4 There is an incorrect calculation of bespoke SANG since only 10 ha are proposed within site but the new population requires 21 ha. This will impact viability if contained in site (65 ha approx) - there is not an additional 10 ha in currently proposed SANG pre-allocated schedule in infrastructure report (Russell Place Farm)

1.5 There is an incorrect evaluation of contribution of land within and between settlements to Green Belt "openness" -the previous PINS decisions in three appeals asserts "openness". GBC state there is no "openness" yet all land parcels in the site are 'red' sensitivity in GBCS Vol 2 Addendum 1 & 2 and all contribute to the 3 key purposes of the Green Belt.

1.6 There is a failure to engage with Rushmoor under the duty to co-operate rules in regards of traffic impact from Aldershot Urban Extension (3,800 homes) The increased commuting to Guildford plus new local vehicles (1,375 estimated) will take the A323 to over design capacity and produce perpetual congestion

1.7 The one railway bridge in Glaziers Lane + 1 railway tunnel in Westwood Lane on North Downs line are restricted (tunnel single lane) with poor geometry and have poor safety records with one fatality in last 15 years and there is no plan in the infrastructure report to widen bridge or replace tunnel (Network Rail). This will lock traffic from new development within site to the north of Flexford. C and D class roads are not designed for volumes indicated in Scenario 5.

1.8 The flood risk will be significantly increased when land is developed. The site lies on the Hogs Back spring line and the land is natural SuDS. There is a stream running through the site with flood risk 3a. Civil engineering mitigation is unlikely to be effective.

1.9 The site will introduce 300+ dogs and 250+ cats within 1km of TBHSPA and SANG will not stop increased disturbance and predation on the SPA.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2239  **Respondent:** 8893697 / Gill Woolfson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**I object strongly to the strategic development in Normandy/Flexford, Policy A46 in the plan**

1. *the developer's site MasterPlan has different boundaries to GBC. It stretches further east and does not include the northermost piece of land. It may be more than 46ha. Is the developer finding it difficult to fit everything promised onto the original site? The village green, promised as a central meeting point in A46, is not there. The SANG will require at least another 21ha of land in addition to the 46ha. This is not mentioned in the GBC Plan.*
Loss of sustainability

In the Settlement Hierarchy Normandy scored highly for sustainability, largely for its community spirit, rather than facilities. Flexford had only open green space, an infrequent bus (now at risk), a school bus, access to the A31 and a station. GBC would seem to be set on damaging the most sustainable aspect of Normandy, its community spirit, by doubling the size of the village. Already a much greater number of houses than usual are for sale in Normandy. I suspect that many more will join them if A46 is approved. The community and the spirit that goes with it will disappear. Normandy will be less sustainable. Flexford is even worse off. It will lose its green space and the train will be much more crowded; standing or no place at all at peak times.

In exchange Normandy and Flexford get shops, which they don't need.

Objections

The need for this strategic site is not based on evidence

The need for a school is not based on evidence, as required by the NPPF, but by a developer-led plan which offers a free school. In essence, GBC is agreeing to a proposal to build a 7FE secondary school in the Green Belt, where the roads are inadequate, public transport overstretched, where there are currently only 20 children and no opportunity to cycle or walk to school.

There is no need for another secondary school in West Guildford. In 2013 the draft Sustainability Appraisal specifically stated that there was adequate secondary school provision throughout the Borough, except Central Guildford. The GBC 2013 Plan contained the sites at Blackwell Farm and Ash. So what has changed between 2013 and 2016? The number of houses in Blackwell Farm has been reduced from 2,250 to 1,800. The number of developments in Ash has been reduced, but a strategic site of 67ha has been added, so it is difficult to compare, but the number of hectares available for development has been reduced. So why, if there was not a shortage of secondary school places in 2013, is there one now? The children from the Normandy/Flexford site should not be included in the numbers, as it would be in contradiction to logic (a circular argument, the school exists because of the children who exist because of the school).

It uses Green Belt Land without proving exceptionality. The land used by this site has been assessed as the most sensitive Green Belt by GBC. There is also a risk, if the housing is built before the school, that there is no need for a school after all. The Green Belt will have been destroyed and the school, for which exception to building on the Green Belt was made, will not materialise. If the school is built first, it may turn out to be a white elephant.

NPPF 89 refers

The Infrastructure required is not there

Sewerage.

Sewerage in Normandy is problematic. Two years ago the sewer under Glazier's Lane collapsed, and when it was fixed the next section of the pipe collapsed. Last year the pipe broke between Normandy and Willey Green. An operation that involved three tankers on rotation was put in place to take our sewage away for about three weeks. There are houses in Orchard Close that have been experiencing problems with sewage overflow in their gardens for 20 years. Will the sewers be able to cope with a vastly increased population and two schools?

Transport

The A323, the road that passes through Normandy, is nearing capacity. Significant new developments further west will place additional strain on this road. Improvements to the A323 through Normandy are not due until 2021 - 2026. The budget allocated is small. Their nature is unspecified and they are not guaranteed. Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane form the borders of the Normandy/Flexford Site. Westwood Lane, C16, is a narrow country lane on which two entrances into the Normandy/Flexford site are planned. It is single lane at the rail bridge. Glaziers Lane, D60, is even narrower and there are no planned improvements.
The Normandy/Flexford site is considered sustainable because it is next to Wanborough station. Children from Ash attending the school and commuters to Guildford are expected to use the train. The train will not provide the level of service suggested, as it is already busy at peak times, and as the AUE develops, will be full when it leaves Aldershot, before calling at Ash, Wanborough and Guildford.

Policy A46 emphasises travel by bus, train and bike, but the reality is that owing to shortcomings in these modes of transport, perhaps as many as 1,000 residents' cars will stream in and out of this site at peak times. Additionally significant numbers of pupils and staff of the secondary school (1,200 pupils and 300 staff) will also use car to get to school. Even with the anticipated improvements to the A323 and Westwood Lane, the effect on the roads will be severe.

**Lack of infrastructure makes the site unsustainable**

The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) 5.3.3 states that continued overuse of cars will result in "Adverse economic, social and environmental impacts of high traffic volumes and a culture of dependence on private car use including recurrent traffic congestion on certain parts of the network at certain times of day, road collisions, community severance, obesity, noise pollution, local air pollution, greenhouse gas emissions, high demand for parking, and amenity of local neighbourhoods."

The SA recommends that developments have Green Travel Plans. Government Policy is to increase cycling and walking as a means of travel (Active Travel (2011)).

**Walking**

The only employment on the site will be the school and the retail centre. Employees of the school and shops living on the site will be able to walk to work, everyone else will need to commute. The children on the site will be able to walk to school; all other pupils will need to commute. Walking to the retail centre will be possible for most residents on the site. Walking opportunities are limited.

**Cycling**

The local roads are used by adult cyclists. More cyclists on the road will delay traffic. There is no space on local roads for dedicated cycle lanes, nor do GBC have plans for any. The Christmas Pie Trail is unsuitable for year round travel. (See Page 4). I would not want a child of mine to use it, as it is unlit and passes through woods. It will be possible to cycle on the site. Cycling opportunities are limited. (See Annex C)

**Train**

The train has little spare capacity. (See Annex C)

**Bus**

BT 4 in the Transport Strategy promises a significant bus network A46 / key destinations including Guildford and the Blackwater Valley. There is no room for bus lanes on the A323, nor do GBC have plans for any. Buses, including school buses, will be stuck in traffic with cars. The bus is expensive. Parents would prefer their children to be able to walk and cycle to school, rather than have to pay for the bus.

**Summary**

This site does not offer any viable Green Travel plans, or opportunity for Active Travel. It is unsustainable.

The NPPF 30 and 35

**Heritage Assets**

It is a core principle of the NPPF to conserve heritage assets so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations. There are seven Grade II listed buildings and one Grade II listed tomb adjoining or close to, this site. The houses are: Westwood Place, Buckhurst, Great Westwood, Halsey's Cottage and Glaziers. The other buildings are: Great Westwood Barn and St Mary's Church. The tomb is the Pirbright Tomb. Glaziers and Westwood Place face particular threats. Glaziers is within 25m of the site, red for development in GBC's...
Sustainability Appraisal Site Criteria. Glaziers Lane is an ancient lane, mentioned in the 15th century, when it ran from the A323 to Glaziers cottage. Hence Glazier's Lane. Glaziers is therefore a house of some importance.

If GBC had a Heritage Strategy this might contain historic walks in Normandy. It might also consider how to exploit the Roman sites in the area; one in Flexford, two in Willeyn Green and another 1 mile away in Park Barn, along the Roman Road which runs from Farnham to Stoke, passing through Flexford on the way.

**NPPF 129 refers**

*The Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area*

The threat to the SPA from the proposed site has not been given enough weight. Two entrances to the SPA are within easy reach of the site, Dolley's Hill (800m) and Nightingale Road (1k).

Dog walking is of particular concern to SPA managers for the damage they do to the SPA. It can be expected that a large number of residents will have dogs, the pet of choice in the countryside, and will require somewhere to walk them.

However good the SANG provided, it is inevitable that a good number of dog-walkers will prefer to walk their dogs on the SPA, especially in winter, as the SPA is dry and land in Normandy is wet. A46 will harm the SPA.

**NPPF 113 and 117 point 3 and 118 point 1 refer**

*Degradation of Ancient Woodland and Ancient Trees and loss of Biodiversity*

This site, which runs from the railway line to the backs of the houses on the A323, is a complete north/south barrier which will destroy green corridors used by wide ranging species such as deer and hedgehogs to move across southern Normandy.

Ancient Trees, registered on the Ancient Trees Inventory, are at risk of damage from children, cats and dogs, pollution and the building work required to develop the site.

There is ancient woodland both on the site and adjoining it. Both will be degraded by cat predation. The woodland on site will be further damaged by children and pollution. Green corridors between the ancient woodland will be lost.

Wyke Churchyard SNCI is within 400m of the site. This SNCI contains the rare Green Winged Orchid, which is sensitive to disturbance. I do not hold out any hope of these rare plants surviving the building work. Normandy Common SNCI will be affected by pollution.

Surrounding this site are many UK BAP sites, which will be disturbed by the initial build in particular, birds being especially vulnerable. The (Wild) Birds Directive 79/409/EEC, 1979. "To protect all naturally occurring wild bird species and their habitats, with particular protection of rare species." refers. GBC Policy 14 states "The Council will conserve and enhance biodiversity and will seek opportunities for habitat restoration and creation, particularly within and adjacent to Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs)". There is a Traditional Orchard BOA bordering the site, within the settlement boundary. Rather than seeking opportunities to restore this BOA, this Plan will harm it by surrounding it with development.

The SANG will not compensate for this loss of biodiversity, nor will the gardens of the development, which will not provide the openness required by many bird species that currently use the site. If this development goes ahead Normandy will have a net loss of Biodiversity of approx 46ha.

**NPPF 118 point 1 and 109 point 3 refer**

*Loss of Agricultural Land*

This land is currently farmed. It is mostly hay meadow, with some pigs and horses. It is Grade 3 agricultural land. The Government places a high priority on using lower grade agricultural for building, and retaining other grades for food production. This Grade 3 land should remain in agriculture. A further 21ha of agricultural land nearby will be lost to the SANG.
NPPF 112 refers

Flooding

The site is Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3 in places. The site is one of the sources of the Hoe Stream.

NPPF 100 refers.

Degradation of the view from the Hog's Back AGLV/AONB

GBC’s POLICY P1 states that. All proposals will be considered against whether they conserve and/or enhance the setting and views of the AONB.

The best views from the Hog's Back along the A31 are to the North, towards Normandy. A46 will bring a large expanse of taller buildings with street lighting. In summer the site will be partially hidden by trees, but at night it will be clearly visible, and also in winter when the trees are bare. Light pollution and dense housing will spoil the view from the Hog's Back. This development will neither conserve nor enhance the AONB but will harm it.

NPPF 115 refers

Summary

A46 is not sustainable. The need for school on this site has not been arrived at by means of evidence. The infrastructure is not there. In my view there are seven contradictions to principles in the NPPF. Some of these cite exceptional need as a reason for ignoring the principle, however, is it reasonable to ignore loss of Biodiversity and likely damage to the SPA and spoiling the view from the Hogs Back and Flood Zones 2 & 3 and spoiling Grade II listed houses and losing agricultural land?

I am at a loss as to how the current residents of Normandy and Flexford will benefit from this plan, or in what way Normandy and Flexford will be more sustainable.

More information in Annex C

NPPF 87 - 89, 30, 35, 129, 118, 112 and 115 refer

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3301</th>
<th>Respondent: 8893697 / Gill Woolfson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support the removal of site A46, Normandy and Flexford Strategic Site, from the plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3099</th>
<th>Respondent: 8896673 / James Gooden</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

ENVIRONMENT

We object to the development proposed by GBC as 20 years of research evidence has shown that the continual fragmentation of natural habitat has caused the dramatic decline of our birds and wildlife species to levels when even our most popular species are under threat. Gardens planned for this development are not enough to combat this decline.

All habitat within or adjoining the parcel of land called A46 are priority habitats under the NERC Act including protected species. Therefore it is vital that this is a key consideration when drafting the Local Plan. However GBC has failed to adequately consider the protection of wildlife within Policy 14.

The following are becoming increasingly rare in the local area:-
Hedgehogs, Dormice, Great Crested Newts, Barn Owls, Stag Beatles, Skylarks, Toads, Lizards, Grass Snakes, Adders, Slow worms, Badgers, Bats.

There are vitally important ecological networks (green infrastructure corridors) that surround A46 (namely Ancient and Semi-natural Woodland, Veteran Trees, Hedgerows, Semi-improved Grassland, Farmland and the Stream which flows along the back of Guildford Road properties lining the field at the back of The Old Vicarage, Wyke). These connect to other important and protected sites within Normandy Parish and the wider countryside (namely Wanborough and Normandy Woods Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI), A47 The Paddocks SNCI, Normandy Pond SNCI (into which the stream runs) , Normandy Common SNCI (put forward by the Surrey Local Nature Partnership in 2015), Wyke Churchyard SNCI and Little Flexford SNCI.)

This site is in close proximity (0.8 km) to the European Nature 2000 "Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area" that hosts 3 rare ground-nesting bird species in a rare heathland habitat.

GBC should apply constraints when calculating the overall housing target in the Borough because of the TBHSPA (NPPF). GBC has not applied constraints and so are compromising sensitive 'designated wildlife sites and landscapes' for pro development. A46 is an 'unsustainable' development so therefore fails Policy 5.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3103  Respondent: 8896673 / James Gooden  Agent:

Document:   Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A46 WAS NOT PROPOSED OR CONSIDERED AS A STRATEGIC SITE IN THE FIRST CONSULTATION

A46 'strategic site', was not previously proposed in an earlier consultation It is not appropriate development at this stage. In 2014's consultation A46 was 'safeguarded'. It was not removed from the Metropolitan Greenbelt. 'Exceptional circumstances' have not been demonstrated or approved by the Inspectorate. You can't just inset boundaries around pieces of greenbelt, A46/A47/A50 and urbanise them. They must remain Green Belt, according to the recent Solihull ruling. So we object to GBC's proposal to build over Green Belt land with the Local Plan.

In addition there has been no meaningful engagement made or requested from local people. We object to the fact that GBC have not listened to residents and have breached the National Planning Policy Frarrnewora (NPPF).
We understand that two of the key concepts that underpin the Local Plan are: Sustainability and Sensitivity. Individual settlements are ranked on both counts and development is favoured in the most sustainable ones whereas it is least favoured in the most sensitive ones. What is significant here is that for the purposes of assessing Sustainability, Normandy and Flexford have been treated as one settlement which maximises its score on this count - whereas in terms of Green Belt Sensitivity the open area between the two settlements is disregarded which reduces our score on that one. This is simply inconsistent. Infact the original data (used in the first consultation) identified Normandy as one settlement. The data was rewritten in 2014 dividing the settlements in two. Data cannot be changed.

We object to the deliberately misleading and inconsistent calculations used to override our Green Belt. GBC’s intention to build 1,100 new homes in Normandy and Flexford shows no objective assessment of the needs of existing residents in these settlements.

Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area’s SANG Avoidance Strategy is about to expire (2016). We object to the fact that a new Avoidance Strategy for TBHSPA is not available. There is 'bespoke' SANG on A46 but there is no guarantee the SANG will be delivered by the developer.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2129  Respondent: 8898241 / Christine Wilks  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Proposed New Local Plan Normandy & Flexford

I am writing to object to the council’s proposals for Normandy & Flexford in the new Local Plan. Four generations of my family have lived in Normandy and I am fighting for it to stay a country village not a vast housing estate.

I am not a NIMBY and would not object to 200 – 300 homes as the village needs new life but 1,100 is too many for a small community to absorb without the character of the village being changed and the green fields lost forever. What we do need is a retirement complex for lots of elderly residents, Normandy has plenty of these, who could stay here amongst their friends and at the same time free up their family homes for new families. Why can’t some of these proposed homes be retirement bungalows?

Why is Taylor Wimpey suggesting 1,100 homes for Normandy? Presumably this is the maximum number they can fit in to get the maximum profit. Do you have any say in the actual numbers proposed? I suspect it’s a devious plan to threaten us with the maximum number which will eventually be reduced to an acceptable level (say 200 - 300) so that GBC can say magnanimously they have conceded to local opinion when the lower figure was what they had in mind all along but thought we would not accept it at this early stage.

With regard to the secondary school, there is no proven need at present for this. According to recent figures there are spaces available at most other local schools. There is only a need if all these new developments in the Local Plan go ahead. GBC are illegally sacrificing the Green Belt in order to fit in a secondary school somewhere that might be needed some time in the future if all these houses are built, a circular argument.

I have not even touched on the traffic chaos that will ensue on our quiet country roads, the C16 Westwood Lane and D60 Glaziers Lane, with all those extra car journeys, especially in the rush hour, from all the workers and additional 1,000+ secondary school children in this new development adding to the existing traffic. There is no way these roads can be improved to accommodate the extra traffic. Sometimes the stationery queue for the Ash level crossing two miles away is back to Normandy at busy times. How will all these additional commuters cope with that?
At present people enjoy living in Normandy because

a) it’s a quiet village

b) we have countryside within the village and all around us

c) we are not joined to any other conurbation (yet!)

d) our local school and surgery can cope (just about) with our numbers

e) our roads are relatively safe, apart from congestion at rush hour or if anything goes wrong on the A31 or A3 and we become a rat run

f) our fields are full of natural wildlife with beautiful animals and birds etc.

All of these reasons would be cancelled out by this huge development.

How do you justify your Local Plan against the Conservative’s pledge made by David Cameron in July 2015 “We will always protect the Green Belt”. GBC are now breaking this promise. Once the open fields are gone it’s too late. Please reconsider this particular development and at the very least reduce the number of houses planned.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2250  Respondent: 8898241 / Christine Wilks  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Agree with Amendment 1 Removal of Site Allocation A46 regards new secondary school and 1,100 proposed houses in Normandy

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1812  Respondent: 8900289 / Teri Hodgson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to lodge my objection to the new version of the local plan, in particular the inclusion of site A46 in Normandy.

I understand Taylor Wimpey have offered to build a secondary school as part of their development of this site and while I can see how a free school may be very attractive to GBC, a recent consultation with the 2 nearest secondary schools (Kings Manor in Park Barn and Ash Manor in Ash) has revealed that they are both currently significantly undersubscribed and both have the option to expand their capacity, should it be needed in the future.
A new secondary school in this part of the borough is not only unwelcome but would be detrimental to our current schools. GBC’s assertion that site A46 should be removed from the Green Belt protection because a new secondary school is required is very ill-advised and will not stand up to any scrutiny if / when this case is taken to court.

Further, no thought appears to have been given the infrastructure that will be needed to support over 1,000 new homes and 1,500 school places. Westwood Lane narrows to a single lane under the railway line and forms a blind junction for people exiting from Beech Lane. GBC is proposing to add approximately 6,000 car journeys to this already hazardous road which will also add to the traffic congestion we already see in the villages of Flexford and Normandy.

If new housing really is needed (in the face of Brexit I expect housing will steadily decline over the next 5-10 years), I strongly recommend that it is spread evenly across the borough and limited to no more than 50 new houses in each village and that the Green belt remains undeveloped for future generations and the Surrey wildlife to enjoy. On a related note, I would also like to insist that any affordable housing be distributed evenly throughout the borough, and within each new development [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature]

In summary, building on greenbelt land is wholly unacceptable and I will do everything in my power to ensure this does not happen.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
14. I object that A46 was not consulted under Regulation 18.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I wish to object to the inclusion of site 46 (Flexford/Normandy) within the Guildford Draft Local Plan.

Site 46 is within the green belt and the only justification for removing this status is the supposed need for a secondary school (this view is substantiated by the Council executive’s own amendment to the draft plan). The need for a new secondary school has not been demonstrated nor has it been shown why it should be in this location.

The reason for the inclusion of a secondary school in site 46 is, in my view, a cynical attempt to circumvent the green belt designation. The original draft plan, withdrawn before the elections in 2015, made only a general reference to a possible increase of school places somewhere in the borough. The developers Taylor Wimpey, who have options on the land in site 46, asked the borough council to add to the draft plan the requirement for a secondary school on their site.

Given the lack of any real evidence of the need for a secondary school this request should have been rejected. The fact that it was not raises issues about the motivation of planners and councillors. I believe a judge would reject this device as a clear manipulation of local planning laws.

I also object to the inclusion of site 46 on the basis that in proposing it the Council is acting ultra vires. Parliament has asked planning authorities to develop plans to meet the anticipated demand for housing within their areas. In doing so they did not want councils to build new towns. The scale of site 46, with 1100 new houses, will eclipse the existing hamlets of Flexford and Normandy.

New towns have previously required primary legislation, and clearly what is proposed on site 46 is not incremental growth but a completely new community. I therefore believe the Council is acting beyond its powers and should expect to be challenged for doing so.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

With regard to the proposed estate A46 in Westwood Lane, Normandy for approximately 1,100 houses.

I must strongly object for many reasons.

I have watched the village slowly develop in size over the last 80 years with small pockets of development, but these still have problems occurring with drainage and flooding.
The new proposal A46 would more than double the size of the Village.

The road system couldn't possibly cope with the volume of extra traffic generated by such a large scale development.

Bridges in Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane would have to be rebuilt to accommodate it.

Taylor Wimpey have offered to build a school in order to achieve their objective. But, as we all know, NO SCHOOL is required as all schools in the area are under subscribed.

Please DO NOT destroy our limited Green Belt. Smaller developments are possible in many areas.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1384  Respondent: 8911233 / Kenneth Hunt  Agent:  

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I MOST STRONGLY OBJECT TO SUCH A PLAN, FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

I am aware that we will probably have some small scale development, but building on such a scale is untenable.

Surely you must consider the infrastructure. Due to the high water table in Normandy we have a big flooding problem, especially in Orchard Close and Zabo Crescent, which of course includes Christmas Pie.

It will be too late to consider this problem when the newly built houses are flooding!!! Hence the need for our Flooding Forum.

Have you seriously considered the access to A46?

The entrance roads would be on roads classified D and C, not to mention the two bridges on Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane, which are dangerous now, being angled and low, and humped and narrow retrospectively. They are definitely not adequate for extra traffic.

(Have the members of Planning actually traversed these routes at a busy time. I guess not.)

NO NEED FOR A SCHOOL! If extra spaces are deemed necessary in the future, Ash Manor and Kings College have space for expansion. The Head of these schools are amenable for this to happen. But, as both schools are UNDER SUBSCRIBED, that won't be happening in the near future.

So once again you are not considering the reality of this plan.

The surgery in Glaziers Lane is already unable to cope with demand. Waiting times can be up to 2 to 3 weeks.

There is also a considerable amount of FLORA and FAUNA on this site which I hope you will be looking carefully at before ruining their habitat. So, doubling the size of Normandy Village would bring the whole place to a standstill, as we already have problems at the junctions of Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane trying to exit onto the A323.

I fear you are trying to take the easy way out, with complete disregard to the plight of the Villagers and the Village.

This amount of housing should be fairly shared around other Villages, NOT DUMPED ON ONE, ruining the life and sole of the whole community and area. THEREFORE I OBJECT TO PLAN A46.
I object most strongly the above strategic site because of the disproportionate scale of the proposed development in relation to the size of the existing settlement areas Normandy and Flexford. A46 is unjustified and will destroy our rural environment where we have chosen to live.

This strategic site was not proposed or considered in the first consultation. In 2014 this site, although it is environmentally sensitive was proposed as ‘safeguarded’ in 2014’s Draft Plan. It was never removed from the Green Belt because ‘exceptional circumstances’ were not demonstrated or approved by the inspectorate, even though GBC employees think it is already safeguarded.

A boundary has been drawn around A46 and inset, however, in the Solihull ruling, boundaries cannot be drawn around land sections and urbanised. The change to the boundary has not been justified. Normandy and Flexford’s ‘needs’ have not been decided by the residents’ but imposed on them by Planning Policy and the Planning Executive.

The above proposed development is on Metropolitan Greenbelt and is outside the settlement area. The essential characteristics of the Green Belt are the ‘openness and permanence’. (Also applies to A47/A49) A development of 1,100 residential units a parade of shops, a primary school, a secondary school, a residential home or care home for 60 residents, the Borough’s allocation of showman plots with yards for machinery and storage, and extra 8 flats in Glaziers Lane access area, 8 flats with extended car parking facilities at the station will permanently destroy Normandy and Flexford’s rural environment.

The west of the Borough is under continual encroachment by creeping urbanisation. No special circumstances have been identified which would clearly outweigh the substantial harm to the greenbelt. GBC reject that the land proposed for Policy A46 fails to contribute to the “openness” of the Green Belt, however on four separate occasions the inspectorate's verdict has recognised the ‘openness’ of the Green Belt. The Plan ignores the ‘openness’ of the Green Belt.
This large development is only 800m from the TBHSPA so is within the 400m - 5km zone of protection. The TBHSPA contains a SSSI recognised as one of the key Natura 2000 European sites. A46 will exacerbate all 5 threats. The 5 key threats have a high rating status, air pollution, human intrusion disturbance, no funded management plan, recreational us (dog walking causing disturbance), species composition change. There is no evidence proving SANG attracts dog walkers away from the TBHSPA and there is no evidence that funding will be available to ensure that the SANG will be maintained in the future. The number of dogs and dog walkers using the latest proposed SANG by the developer will turn it into a mud bath during the winter months, in comparison the dry TBHSPA will encourage dog walkers to use that instead. Over 1,100 residential homes will have a detrimental impact on this fragile SSSI habitat through dog walking and an increase in recreational activities. Natural England is against this strategic site.

GBC should have considered all the Habitats Regulations when assessing A46. It has not.

GBC should have applied constraints when calculating the overall housing target (already controversial) because of the TBHSPA, Greenbelt and AONB but has chosen not to do so but is instead compromising designated wildlife, designated habitats for development. Any development within the protection zone of the TBHSPA should be ‘restricted’ according to the NPPF. A46 is not.

The location, scale and high density form of this development significantly differs with the linear characteristics of existing development in Flexford and Normandy. The above development will destroy the green approach to Westwood Lane from the A323.

Normandy has lost all five shops due to the change in residents shopping habits (they were not supported) so closed because they were no longer economically viable. Residents now have the convenience of having shopping delivered to their doorstep via the internet or from the milkman (Milk and More) with a wide choice of basics again delivered to their doorstep. Although the development offers retail, historically it will not survive in Normandy because it will not be supported by locals. There is no need. Normandy and Flexford are only 6 miles away from any of the major supermarkets and there are also excellent Cooperative’s in Ash, Ash Wharf and Rydes Hill. How many more shops do you need? People chose to live here because of the rural location not because of shops or lack of pubs.

Flexford and Normandy is sandwiched between Surrey Hills AONB and Ash and Pirbright Ranges TBHSPA therefore, both settlements should remain ‘washed over’ by the Green Belt as stated in NPPF para.86 “If it is necessary to prevent development in a village primarily because of the important contribution which the open character of the village makes to the openess of the Green Belt, the village should be included in the Green Belt”. A46 between Flexford and Normandy is the only panoramic view of the Hog’s Back (Surrey Hills) on the West of the Borough. Both the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and Surrey Hills are being encroached by the high density building in Ash and Tongham.

Policy D4 states that, ‘new development within inset villages will have particular regard to ‘important’views of the village from the surrounding landscape’. The urbanisation of A46 proposal will impact on news from the Surrey Hills AONB during daylight hours and light pollution during darkness. There is no ‘important relationship between A46, the built development and the surrounding landscape’.

Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. (NPPF) A46 is harmful to the Green Belt. When considering any planning in Green Belt LPA should ensure that substantial weigh is given to any harm to the Green Belt. ‘Very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations (NPPF).

Green Belt in planning practice guidance states, ‘Unmet housing need (including traveller sites) is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the ‘very special circumstances’ justifying inappropriate development on a site within Green Belt (NPPF)’

A46 has been proposed as a suitable site for a new Secondary School even though Normandy and Flexford is not attached to a urban area. A school has not been proven or justified.
In its last submission to GBC (July 2014) Surrey County Council, in its official response, said: "A site within the proposed urban extension at Blackwell Farm, with all necessary access infrastructure built in and a catchment surrounding the site, would be a more sustainable location in transport terms for a new secondary school to serve the western side of Guildford." Guildford Borough Council has chosen to ignore this statement.

GBC have not supplied evidence on how a school in a rural location will be financed.

There is a capacity of 1,216 already with a number of schools with plenty of room to expand in the future, with approved expansions at the County School, Guildford and St Peter already in place.

The birthrate in Guildford has fallen over the past two years.

The case for a new secondary school in Normandy is therefore not justified.

GBC are planning to build 450 homes before a new school is even considered. This is not appropriate development of the Green Belt.

Traffic is a huge problem in this area. This can be backed up by Surrey County Council’s traffic simulations. The roads are very congested and are working well over their intended capacity. More traffic will only exacerbate this problem. Site 46 is located well beyond the existing confines of any urban area restricting the potential for sustainable travel. The existence of Wanborough Railway Station is only of a marginal benefit. Access from A46 will join C and D class roads. The traffic generated by A46 and the primary, secondary schools by 1,500 pupils and 200 staff will put enormous strain in this area. There would be access issues relating to visibility and safety for pedestrians and cyclists, which could be difficult to resolve given that the roads are fundamentally rural roads, and the existing structures of the Westwood Lane Railway bridge and the Glaziers Lane railway Road bridge. The restricted headroom of the Westwood Lane bridge would also prohibit double decker buses from accessing the proposed school.

In 2013 the development of 3,850 dwellings (population of approx. 9,000) in Aldershot was approved by Rushmoor Borough Council and is situated about 4 miles from Normandy. The development, over a 15 year period, includes two primary schools, and the provision of a SANG and many other provisions.

Guildford BC responded to the plan in 2013 (ref: 13/P/00108) and in that said that GBC objected to the application on the grounds that insufficient information had been provided to allow a full assessment on the impact of that development on the highways network and said "the impact on Surrey's network and mitigation required has not been established". In its response to that planning application, Hampshire County Council, dealing with Highways and Transport issues, hardly referred to the A323. This proves the lack of communications between communities.

There is no evidence to whether the water companies can even supply the infrastructure needed for such a large developments. Will there even be enough water for the approx 40,000+ homes in a 10 mile radius? Worrying! Will there be enough gas, electricity, drainage, sewage issues. WHERE IS THE EVIDENCE!!
The garden argument is often used by developers, however the fragmentation of our ancient woodlands (only 4% of ancient woodland is left in the UK) grasslands and hedgerows is having a devastating impact on our bird, mammal and insect populations. Even our most common species are now in danger. Destroying this precious habitat on A46 exacerbate this issue.

A46 will take 15 years to build. Existing homes border the entire site. We as residents will be subjected to living around a building site for 15 years, putting up with site traffic. The continual noise and pollution generated by the developer will be excessive. Planning Policy has not fully considered the location of the site and the traffic impact of A46 will have on this rural community. This will lead to stress and health issues.

The Plan should have taken into account the residents ‘needs’ of Flexford and Normandy, it does not. A46 is ‘unsustainable’ and inappropriate development of the Green Belt. The Plan is not just, fair or acceptable. It is designed to impact on a few communities because it is easier for Planning Policy to develop a few ‘strategic sites’, rather than sensible development throughout the Borough which will not impact on infrastructure.

The same core principles of the NPPF apply to A47/A49 including lack of infrastructure, traffic congestion, environmental implications, flooding the Greenbelt, the THBSPA and the AONB.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This site 46 is still in use as open country and work – as a place for people to walk and a place for farmers to graze cattle and raise livestock – see cows on site 46 field May 2016.

4.4.46 states ‘We will support rural and agricultural initiatives that improve local services and facilities and contribute to the rural economy. We need to balance the creation of new business opportunities with the needs of the farming industry. Farming is an important contributor to the rural economy; it can help to maintain the landscape, which helps to attract tourists, and helps to produce food locally.’

This site is farmed and used for hay. We cannot afford to lose agricultural land like this at a time where costs are rising post Brexit.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5913  Respondent: 8916673 / R Atkins  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to object to the proposals on site A46 on the draft local plan for the following reasons,

1) There is no requirement for a new secondary school on the site because numerous local schools are under subscribed. Kings College at Park Barn is under utilised by a significant number and there is no logical or common sense reasons for the placing of a new secondary school in this green belt area. Proposals I believe are being considered for a railway station at Park Barn and this, together with the under subscription of school numbers at Kings College, would point to a far better utilisation of this school. Other schools are also under subscribed in the nearby area. Further, a new school at Woking opened last September and a new technical college is due to open in 2018.

2) The infrastructure is not suitable for the suggested proposals. Glaziers Lane is an unclassified road and Westwood Lane is classified as a class C road. Hunts Hill is a narrow road and School Lane is unsuitable for a large amount of traffic due to its narrowness and the school that it houses for children aged 5 to 11. The A323 is a very busy road and Wanborough Hill that serves the Hogs Back is heavily used due to its link with the Hogs Back. Both the A323 and Hogs Back are roads that are blocked for considerable periods of time during the peak work hours.

The school at Wyke takes children from ages 5 to 11. When they move to secondary schools all the children and their parents have a large selection of schools to choose from in the surrounding area. This practice has been long established and allows a large selection of schools to be chosen from. As at point 1 many of these schools are under subscribed.

Doctors appointments are difficult to obtain in the Normandy area. The saving grace of the main doctors surgery at Fairlands in Worplesdon avoids the potential risk to the health of residents of the Normandy area.

The water supply is now metered but the area is subject to flooding and worse the sewage system seems unable to cope with demand. The flooding of the area has at times meant raw sewage is a particular problem in parts of Normandy.

In summary I would like to point out that I am not against the utilisation of the right areas for development when carried out to the right scale. However, this proposal, on this area of green belt with its historic links to the past, is not suitable for its inclusion in the local plan. For the reasons that I have identified I object to the proposal and can find no logical reasoning for this proposal to be approved.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1375</th>
<th>Respondent: 8916769 / Andene Aaronson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

For the attention of Planning Services, Guildford Borough Council

I am writing to object to the proposed development of the A46 strategic site which will transform Normandy and Flexford from villages in the Green Belt to a large settlement. My objections are as follows.

Normandy and Flexford are being treated as one settlement for the purposes of sustainability and as two settlements for the purposes of sensitivity. This inconsistency undermines the argument for development in this area.

There is no evidence of a requirement for a new secondary school in the west of Guildford borough. A number of local secondary schools are undersubscribed so there seems no justification for taking land out of green belt for this purpose.

The local infrastructure is already under strain: there are two rail bridge bottlenecks, on Glaziers Land and Westwood Lane, where the roads narrow. On Westwood Lane there is one way traffic and there is effectively a blind chicane on Glaziers Lane. The station is already frequently flooded and only accessible in wellington boots. Presumably further development will mean more runoff and further flooding and waterlogging in fields. The clay soil in the fields earmarked for development are already often punctuated by great ponds of standing water.

The site is rich in wildlife and ancient woodland and hedgerows, all of which are protected under the Green belt designation. It is not clear why none of this matters any more, particularly when set against the above disadvantages of developing the site.

I am dismayed at the way that Guildford Borough Council has conducted itself with regard to this planning process, that it could hold Green Belt land in such low regard, and that it could be so influenced by developer thinking where commercial considerations (and profit for the developer) are at the fore and not the protection of our precious Surrey countryside.

I hope that the planning process will thoroughly examine the underlying justification for development on this site and that it will become clear that for the community as a whole the costs outweigh the benefits.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3975</th>
<th>Respondent: 8917185 / N.A. &amp; N.J. Colwell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

We strongly object to the proposals for Normandy and Flexford for the following reasons:-

1. The local plan does not explain what exceptional circumstances justify such a large removal of precious greenbelt land.

1. The proposed development is disproportionate to that proposed in other local areas and seems wholly influenced by pressure from a major developer.

1. We understand that the need for a school is not proven.
1. The road system around Normandy cannot cope with the level of traffic at rush hours at present without the huge increase in traffic that would arise from 1100 houses accessing onto Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane and the twice daily drop offs and pick ups at a secondary school for 1500 pupils who would not all live locally and be able to walk or get public transport to school. There are already safety problems with Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane used as "rat runs", speeding traffic and the single lane railway bridge on Westwood Lane. There appear to be no plans to address this problem in the local plan.

1. The drainage, water supply and medical facilities would not cope with the proposed house numbers without considerable investment that does not appear to be proposed in the plan. The area is very prone to flooding and again this has not been taken into account.

1. Brownfield sites in and around Guildford are being ignored.

The proposals completely ignore previous comments made by a majority of residents about the loss of greenbelt and the open character of the area which will be lost forever purely for commercial gain.

These proposals should be rejected.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

I strongly object to the proposed development on the above green belt site. I am a lifetime resident of Glaziers Lane Normandy and whilst I appreciate that houses are needed throughout the borough I am appalled at the massive development proposed for this site which will totally destroy our rural environment. The openness of this site was recognised in the Green Belt & Countryside Study but seems to be ignored by the Planning Policy team. Instead we will have to live with light pollution, noise and an urban centre which will destroy the village we love.

I understand that it is considered that a 7FE Secondary School is needed in the west of the borough and that the provision of such a school would constitute “exceptional circumstances” that are required to remove the land from the Green Belt. This site has important flora and fauna and is only 1 km away from the Thames Valley Heaths that has 3 rare ground nesting bird species in rare heathland habitat and a large development could have a detrimental effect on the TBHSPA. The site which is Grade 3 arable and pastoral land was stated by Councillor Spooner at our Parish Council Meeting in February to have “red Sensitivity”.

**School**

The question is: is the school actually needed? From detailed research carried out by Keith Witham our Surrey County Councillor for Worplesdon Division (including Normandy, Pirbright and Worplesdon) it appears that Surrey Education Department have unfilled secondary places in the west of the borough in the medium term to cater for over 700 children and other schools are willing to expand. He gave an example, Kings College School in Guildford, one of the nearest schools to Normandy which is undersubscribed by 57%, only 43% of its places are filled. The Council has no doubt been provided with all the details of Keith Witham’s detailed research. If these figures are correct why should children have to travel to Normandy by train, bus or car when they have schools nearer to them? I also understand that the birth rate in Guildford is falling which surely weakens the arguments for the need of this school in Normandy. I understand too that both Ash Manor and Kings College are willing to expand if the need arises and have the available land.
In the worst scenario, if the development went ahead even with 1100 extra households eventually, there would not be enough local children of secondary school age to fill the school.

My opinion is that the school is not required and following Councillor Bilbe’s amendment to the draft Local Plan at the Planning Meeting on 24th May the strategic site at Normandy should be excluded in its entirety. If this view, which is strongly felt by many residents as you are no doubt aware, is ignored will you also consider the following points:

**Roads/Traffic Chaos**

This development would link up to roads classified as C16 (Westwood Lane and Wanborough Hill) and D60 (Glaziers Lane-unclassified road). The stress on these local roads would be extreme. Already these local lanes grind to a halt at peak times massively threatening the health of old people and children with exhaust pollution, and increased traffic from the homes proposed and a huge secondary school with daily drop off and pick-ups would make the situation untenable. As I understand it a new railway station proposed at Park Barn should alleviate some of the traffic problems but would not be in operation before 2033! Westwood Lane with a low railway bridge and one way traffic would not be viable for large HGVs, making it particularly difficult during the building stages which would force heavy traffic from A31 and A323 onto Glaziers Lane which has a narrow hazardous railway bridge over the railway line. In addition large vehicles, including buses coming off the A323 have to come across both lanes as they turn into Glaziers Lane which creates a dangerous situation for vehicles going onto or crossing the A323. I recall too that in recent years Glaziers Lane has had problems with subsidence on the corner coming off the A323. Would it not be at enormous risk with the heavy increase of traffic especially contractors vehicles etc? There is also a small Nursery School in Glaziers Lane and parents have to stop in the road to drop off and collect their children which reduces the road outside the school to one way traffic at those times.

Both railway bridges were never intended to handle the level of traffic that would be generated and the already congested junctions at peak times will create traffic chaos and an increase in accident rates is inevitable. The existing traffic on the A323 at present is invariably jammed up at peak times and this will obviously get worse with traffic generated from the proposed development and from the vehicles that could come from the 3850 homes planned by Rushmoor Council which is only 4 miles away. How would we ever get out of Glaziers Lane in the future –at the very least least we would need traffic lights or a large roundabout.

**Flood Risk/Sewage**

Normandy/Flexford has a very high water table with water draining down from the Hogs Back and from the Ash Ranges and flooding in wet periods is a frequent occurrence throughout the village so with a vastly increased population the sewer system and drainage are a major concern. Some residents regularly experience sewage back flow during wet weather and other areas, for example the Wanborough Station forecourt floods badly and if the land in question is built over it seems inevitable that these problems will increase.

**Doctors Surgery**

There is a small surgery in Glaziers Lane next to Manor Fruit Farm (on this site is Normandy Therapy Garden, a play area, Guildford Archery Club and the site for village activities such as the annual November 5th bonfire, August Bank Holiday Fete etc and the excellent Village Hall with first class parking)

The main surgery is 3 miles away at Fairlands. There is no mention in the plan that a new surgery is included –has thought been given to how the new and existing residents

would be cared for as it is difficult now to get appointments and having to go to the main surgery is a frequent occurrence?

**Conclusion**

I consider that the residents of Normandy have been let down by all these proposals as they appear to have been developed in complete secrecy by the Council working with the Developers, Taylor Wimpey until we were eventually
told of the Plan at the beginning of April. This makes complete nonsense of the quote from The Times newspaper on 25th April 2016 when David Cameron and George Osborne wrote: “We will always protect the green belt and make sure planning decisions are made local people”

We know and accept the need for more homes but surely it would be better if small groups of houses were built throughout the borough where the new occupants could blend into the village surroundings and the existing occupants rather than creating a few large “urban” sites which will destroy the sense of community which exists at present.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5939  Respondent: 8918721 / Jan Drake  Agent:
Account:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to object to the proposed A46 site development at Normandy/Flexford contained in the current GBC local plan.

I have lived in Glaziers Lane for 6 years and, as I’m sure is the case for the majority of villagers, love the fact that it has a rural feel and is currently surrounded by greenbelt land. The suggested removal of the greenbelt status of the proposed strategic site is deeply concerning.

How will future infrastructure plans support the sheer number of proposed homes, retail and community services? As I have stated in previous correspondence, I frequently work from home (a few houses down from Wanborough Station) with a clear view of the road from my Study window. Glaziers Lane is heavily used as a cut through to the A31/A3 and the blind bridge over the railway is a hazardous spot where I witness frequent speeding often resulting in dangerous traffic incidents. Any parking on the road immediately prohibits two way traffic which also creates a hazard. Should the proposed plans go ahead there will be a significant increase in traffic load on what is ostensibly a country lane. The same can be said of Westwood Lane on the other side of the proposed site, given that there is a single lane, height restricted bridge under the railway. In addition, the level of traffic joining the A323 already causes tailbacks at peak times, both at the Glaziers Lane & Westwood lane junctions. Obviously the proposed plans would massively increase the number of vehicles using already overstretched routes. Exactly what plans are there to ensure that the roads around the proposed site would in any way be able to support the huge pressure that will be put on the road structure?

Given the close proximity of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area to the A46 site - has it been proven, beyond reasonable doubt, that the proposed development will not have a significant adverse impact on the surrounding environment? Also, with regard to the ancient woodland that is contained within the proposed site, it is suggested that this will be ‘protected’. How can the wildlife here thrive when surrounded by urban lighting, traffic pollution and buildings?

The proposed 7FE school has been put forward as an 'exceptional circumstance' for removing A46 from the greenbelt. On what basis has the need for a secondary school at this site been made? I understand that the two nearest secondary schools to this area (Ash Manor and Kings College) are both heavily undersubscribed. How can such a large school be justified in this instance when "only 1 FE would be needed to serve the strategic development site itself" (as per Appendix C of the Local Plan, Infrastructure Schedule SED3)? The building of this school appears to be solely developer led and that cannot be a justifiable reason to remove the site from the greenbelt.

In conclusion, I fail to see that the negative effect to the community is offset by any benefits and I urge the Council to reconsider the proposed plan for the A46 site.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3409  Respondent: 8919041 / Bill & Gill Stanworth  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

My name is Mrs Gillian Stanworth [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998] for the last 23 years. Pirbright Road (the A324) is on the northern boundary of the village of Normandy, and borders the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA). We moved to Normandy because of it’s location, being semi-rural in nature with lots of open spaces, and other beautiful countryside nearby, whilst at the same time within easy reach of train stations giving direct access to London. Something which attracted us to Normandy was the fact that north of the railway line the village was mainly ribbon development, with no large blocks of high density housing. The fields and woodlands are essential for the unique nature of this village.

I have been involved in various projects and activities in and around Normandy, volunteering at Wyke school and for the Parish Council, and in 2014 my husband and I received the Mayor’s Award for services to the Community. I therefore feel passionately about the future of Normandy and Flexford, and am aghast at the thought of our beautiful countryside being turned into an urban environment. I do not believe that Guildford Borough have not sought the views and wishes of the residents of these two villages when preparing their Local Plan in respect of Normandy and Flexford.

I strongly object to the Proposed Submission Local Plan (the Plan) in relation to the settlements of Normandy and Flexford, in particular, Policy A46, because I do not believe that it passes the Tests of "Soundness" as set out by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraph 182. This requires it to be "Positively prepared", "Justified", "Effective" and "Consistent with national policy". The Ministerial foreword to the NPPF States that "The purpose of planning is to help achieve sustainable development" and this means that Local Plans should be consistent with the presumption in favour of sustainable development. It is my contention that the development proposed in Policy A46 is "unsustainable" and does not therefore meet the policies set out in the NPPF.

1) I object vigorously to the proposal by GBC to inset the settlements of Normandy and Flexford from the Green Belt. Policy P2 of the Plan paragraph 4.3.12 states "...the National Planning Policy states that only those villages whose open character makes an important contribution to the openness of the Green Belt should be included in the Green Belt. Those that do not should be inset, or removed, from the Green Belt..." Paragraph 157 of the NPPF states, inter alia., that Local Plans should "identify land where development would be inappropriate, for instance because of its environmental...significance". Prior to publication of the Plan, GBC indicated that 'major consideration' would be given to protecting existing Green Belt, and that the most valuable Green Belt, areas designated as 'Red Sites' under their own classification system, should not be included in the Plan for development. Normandy and Flexford were given a red status. It is clear that GBC considered the Green Belt of Normandy and Flexford to be inappropriate for development. The decision to inset this Green Belt is not therefore consistent with NPPF policy and is therefore "Unsound".

The land which GBC have proposed for development under Policy A46 is an area comprising mainly Ancient Woodland, open fields and unimproved verges and hedges which are the essence of the Green Belt and which make a valuable contribution to the openness of the Green Belt. The site (A46) lies approximately mid-way between Guildford and Ash/ Tongham, within a swathe of Green Belt. Taking the settlements out of the Green Belt would have a detrimental effect upon that stretch of Green Belt, cutting it in half and destroying part of the rural environment of this area and significantly impacting upon wildlife and wildlife habitats which are part of it. It is just the start of "urban sprawl" which Green Belt was established to prevent. In Appendix A of the Plan,(Glossary), Green Belt is defined as a statutory designation which serves five purposes, the first three being : "checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas", (eg Guildford), "preventing neighbouring towns from merging into each other", (eg Guildford and Ash/Tongham), "assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment..." (eg Site A46).
If Normandy and Flexford are inset from the Green Belt, there could be a continuous stream of new development in this area for years to come. Policy D4 of the Plan states, paragraph 4.5.43 "In addition to site allocations, we anticipate that a range of other development sites will continue to come forward through redevelopment, infilling and conversions." It goes on to say that planning permission will be granted in inset villages, subject to certain conditions. Insetting means that "development is no longer by definition, considered inappropriate" (paragraph 4.5.47). Apparently the important character of these inset villages will be protected using development management policies. I think that this policy just opens the floodgates to the urbanisation of the area between Guildford and Ash/Tongham, much the same as that which has already happened in the Blackwater Valley. Policy P3 of the Plan, paragraph 4.3.33 states however that "National Planning states that we should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and support thriving rural communities within it. For this reason, we will seek to limit any development in the countryside unless..." How can urbanisation possibly protect the existing character of Normandy and Flexford, which are currently small rural communities? If development goes ahead on site A46, the intrinsic character will be destroyed, exacerbated in the future as a result of the implementation of policy D4, thus leading to the decimation of the open spaces which characterise the villages. Damage to the rural environment would be huge and irreversible. 

For these reasons I object to Policies P2, P3 and D4. This is another example where the Plan is not consistent with national policy set out by the NPPF and is therefore "Unsound".

2) Green Belt was also established to "secure nature conservation interest". Green Belt is of huge importance for Biodiversity and it is imperative that we guard against further loss of irreplaceable habitats by unwise development of important areas of land which are currently 'washed over', or part of the Green Belt. This Green Belt is also important for wildlife by providing wildlife corridors between different areas: "It is an integral component of England's ecological network", (CPRE). Insetting the settlements of Normandy and Flexford goes against the approach GBC have said they will adopt in respect of Biodiversity in Policy I4 of the Plan, which states "The Council will conserve and enhance biodiversity and will seek opportunities for habitat restoration and creation, particularly within and adjacent to Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs)." Policy A46 sets out proposals for a huge development of 1100 houses and a 7 form entry secondary school, the impact of which would seriously degrade biodiversity and wildlife habitats. Whatever Green and Blue Infrastructure were provided within the development, this could never achieve "net gains in biodiversity" which is defined in Policy I4 as "biodiversity creation and/or enhancement." Wildlife habitats will be destroyed, existing wildlife corridors eliminated and wildlife impacted by the many stresses placed upon it by a huge development such as that proposed. GBC are required to provide mitigation in the form of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG), but any SANG proposed for site A46 will use an area which is already greenspace, and which will not enhance or create biodiversity.

Within Normandy Parish there are Statutory Designated Sites, the most important of which is the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA). The heathland of the TBH SPA is also a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), and there are several areas of Ancient Woodland and Veteran Trees (which have protection under the NPPF and identified in the Biodiversity Plan for Surrey, as being important for biodiversity. There are also several sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI’s), and other important habitats, including BOA’s (as mentioned above). In my opinion GBC have failed to adhere to the principals they have set out in Policy I4 and the Plan is “unsound” in respect of Normandy and Flexford for this reason.

3) I object to Policy A46 for a number of reasons. GBC have failed to recognise the impact that development such as that envisioned in Policy A46 will have upon

1. a) The TBH SPA and the Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham Special Area of Conservation (SAC; which overlaps with the TBH SPA)
2. b) Other important wildlife habitats within the site itself including Ancient Woodland and upon nearby statutory and non-statutory designated sites.

Re: a) The TBH SPA and the SAC which are European sites under the terms of the “Habitats and Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended)” (Habitats Regulations), are within less than 1 km of site A46. A residential development of this size will have a significant impact upon the unique flora and fauna of this heathland and bog area, both from increased numbers of visitors and their dogs/horses and from various types of pollution from the increased volume of traffic which will result from such a development.
GBC was required to make an appropriate assessment under Paragraph 61 of the Habitats Regulations in respect of the TBH SPA “of the implications for that site in view of that sites conservation objectives…. The authority shall agree to the plan or project only after having ascertained that it will not adversely affect the integrity of the European site.”

In respect of Site A46, I do not agree that the evidence contained in Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) for the Plan is either adequate or up-to-date.

It was only when the draft local plan was published in April 2016 that site A46 was inserted as a “strategic site” for development. Prior to that, in the former draft local plan which came out for Regulation 18 consultation (under “The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012”), (the Regulations) in 2014, site A46 was only a “safeguarded” site. The initial HRA was produced in July 2014 and it seems unlikely that further research to assess the impact of the huge development proposed for site A46 plus its inevitable consequences, has been carried out during 2014 – 2016. The same applies to the SAC, part of which also lies within Normandy Parish. Therefore I do not consider this evidence to be up-to-date. Paragraph 62 (2) of the Habitats Regulations states that “Where the site concerned hosts a priority natural habitat type or priority species”, development under a plan or project can only be carried out for “imperative reasons of overriding public interest” and GBC have not demonstrated any such reasons. This leads me to believe that the evidence is not adequate.

Re: b) According to Natural England and the Forestry Commission, the guidance for planning and development produced for the Government entitled “Ancient Woodland and veteran trees: protecting them from development”, published in October 2014 and updated in October 2015, “Development can affect ancient woodland and veteran trees, and the wildlife they support, on the site and nearby”.

Impacts of development highlighted in this guidance include

“Compacting the soil around tree roots
Damaging roots and soil as well as the understorey
Damaging or destroying trees
Polluting the ground
Changing the woodland’s water table or drainage
Increasing the amount of pollution including dust (e.g. construction phase of any development)
Increasing disturbance to wildlife from additional traffic and visitors
Increasing light pollution
Increasing damaging activities like fly tipping and the impact of domestic pets”

The proposed development in policy A46 would be likely to generate many of these types of problem which would have a huge detrimental impact. Insufficient mitigation measures have been proposed to combat these and future attempts to mitigate are considered unlikely to be adequate.

4) Policy P 2, paragraph 4.3.16 states that “National planning policy requires that Green Belt boundaries are only be amended in exceptional circumstances…” GBC make the following contention in that paragraph “We consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify the amendment of Green Belt boundaries in order to facilitate the development that is needed and promote sustainable patterns of development”. The developer Taylor Wimpey who are behind the decision by GBC to change the designation of site A46 from a “safeguarded” site to a strategic site for development, have said that they will build a 7 form entry secondary school, which GBC say then enables the building of 1100 houses on the site. In my view GBC have failed to prove the need for a secondary school in this location – indeed, the evidence points to there being many vacant places in existing in the West of the borough, as well as proposals to provide additional places
in other locations/ existing schools. I have also been unable to find any evidence to support the contention that the need for a school enables another development such as that proposed for site A46. I am not aware of any legal basis for such an assertion. An article by Mark Challis entitled “Enabling development” – “A look at the position post NPPF” (www.buildingconservation.com) states that, “The term 'Enabling Development' is not a statutory one, but refers to a state of affairs in which development that would otherwise be considered harmful is considered acceptable because it would ‘facilitate’ (or ‘enable’) benefits that outweigh the harm. Typically the benefits in question are the generation of funds that will be used to pay for work done to a listed building or other heritage asset that is in pressing need of substantial repairs”. How can a school facilitate a huge housing development? Moreover the negative effects of the huge development proposed far outweigh the harm that it would cause.

Accordingly there do not appear to be any “exceptional circumstances” to justify the amendment of Green Belt boundaries around Normandy and Flexford, and the Plan is therefore unsound in this respect. In addition the proposal to build a school does not meet any local need for education as set out in the NPPF tests of soundness.

5) Policy I1 of the draft local plan deals with infrastructure and delivery, but there is no attempt to address the difficulties which exist around Normandy and Flexford. Surrey County Council has indicated that the roads in this area already suffer from traffic chaos. Roads around the development site and leading away from it to major networks would be unable to cope with the volume of traffic which would be generated by the proposed development. These roads already become heavily congested during peak periods, or due to an incident elsewhere in the Borough. There is a dangerously narrow bridge over the railway line on Glaziers Lane, and a lethal bridge under the railway line on Westwood Lane. The junctions with Guildford Road are also dangerous, and Wanborough Hill would be seriously impacted by the amount of traffic likely to be generated by the existence of a secondary school and associated development. It is difficult to imagine how the roads could be improved to cope with the extra volume of traffic that would be generated by policy A46. Also the B3000 is frequently seriously congested, exacerbated by the access roads to and from the A31, and Guildford Road (A323) and Pirbright Road (A324) are extremely busy during peak periods. GBC do not appear to have addressed of these problems in any way which can be considered adequate or sustainable.

The existing station has very little provision for parking (12 spaces!) and there appear to be no extra provisions included in the Plan. Glaziers Lane is unsuitable for street parking.

The access to the proposed new housing development (site A46) would also create an increased hazard with the increase in the volume of traffic.

Roads around Normandy, particularly the A323 and the A324 are already going to be seriously impacted by the Aldershot Urban Extension (Wellesley) for 3,850 houses etc which are to be built over a 15 year period, which was approved by Rushmoor Borough Council in 2013. GBC’s transport strategy set out in the Plan has not taken account of the impact that this development will have upon our roads let alone the additional impact which would result if the proposed A46 development were to go ahead.

For these reasons I object to the Transport Strategy as set out in Policy I2.

6) As already stated the proposed development contained within Policy A46 was only published in April 2016. In the previous draft of the Local Plan (2014), this area of land between Normandy and Flexford was designated as a “safeguarded” site. Consultations under Regulation 18 of the Regulations took place in 2013/2014 and so residents of Normandy and Flexford have not had the chance of a consultation on these new development proposals under Regulation 18.

Paragraph 150 of the NPPF states that “Local Plans are the key to delivering sustainable development that reflects the visions and aspirations of local communities.” Paragraph 155 of the NPPF states “Early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods, local organisations and businesses is essential.”

I am not aware of any discussions taking place between GBC and our communities during the preparation stage of the original draft local plan prior to 2014. There is no evidence to suggest that GBC took any notice of representations made during the 2013/2014 consultations, in view of the change that they made to the proposals for Site A46. The Council have
not engaged with us to ascertain what our visions and aspirations are for the villages of Normandy and Flexford, and moreover GBC have not given the local community any chance of a Consultation under Regulation in respect of this proposed development. It is my contention, therefore, that GBC have failed to meet the requirement for the Plan to be prepared with the participation of the Community in respect of Policy A46, and accordingly the Plan is Unsound in this respect.

7) I appreciate that the preparation of a Local Plan is complex, and many documents and reports have to be prepared and studied. However, I did find the Plan quite difficult to navigate around and certain parts were confusing and/or misleading. For example, the Policies numbered I1 to I4 could easily be mistaken as being 11 and 14, so that reference to them would have been incorrect. It was also difficult to find some of the documents and reports referred to in the Plan. Unless as an individual one had a lot of spare time to try to unlock the complexities of the document, it would be a very uphill task indeed and probably impossible for many.

8) In summary:

(a) I strongly object to the Proposed Submission Local Plan (the Plan) in relation to the settlements of Normandy and Flexford, in particular, Policy A46, because I do not believe that it passes the Tests of "Soundness" as set out by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraph 182.

(b) It is my contention that the development proposed in Policy A46 is "unsustainable" and does not therefore meet the policies set out in the NPPF.

(c) I object vigorously to the proposal by GBC to inset the settlements of Normandy and Flexford from the Green Belt. The decision to inset this Green Belt is not consistent with NPPF policy and is therefore "Unsound".

(d) I object to Policies P2, P3 and D4. Where these policies relate to Normandy and Flexford, the Plan is not consistent with national policy set out by the NPPF and is therefore "Unsound".

(e) In my opinion GBC have failed to adhere to the principals they have set out in Policy I4 and the Plan is “unsound” in respect of Normandy and Flexford for this reason.

In respect of the HRA, I do not consider the evidence to be up-to-date or adequate.

(f) There do not appear to be any “exceptional circumstances” to justify the amendment of Green Belt boundaries around Normandy and Flexford, and the Plan is therefore unsound in this respect. In addition the proposal to build a school does not meet any local need for education as set out in the NPPF tests of soundness.

(g) I object to the Transport Strategy as set out in Policy I2.

(h) GBC have failed to meet the requirement for the Plan to be prepared with the participation of the community in respect of Policy A46, and accordingly the Plan is Unsound in this respect.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Policy A46 – Land South of Normandy / North of Flexford

1. **I object:** to the **removal of 1100 homes** from the plan which, in spite of being in Green Belt, the location has a railway station at one corner of the site, plus bus links. This is a sustainable site and should not be removed if Site A35 (Wisley) is to be retained as this is far more sustainable than site A35.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7675  **Respondent:** 8928961 / Sue Reeve  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

**I object to this development**

It seems to me that a development of a 1,000 houses and a school has been stuck on a field with absolutely no thought to the local area, its needs and the environment

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3782  **Respondent:** 8929633 / Mrs Davis  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

**I OBJECT TO:**

1) With reference to site A46 in your proposal to build 1,100 homes on land that has not been removed from the Metropolitan Greenbelt and exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated or approved.

2) There are approximately 3,000 residents in Normandy and the majority of them wish for Normandy to remain a village with the sense of community that that brings. We have no need for a secondary school, as both Ash Manor and Kings College, which serve this parish are undersubscribed and have room for expansion as and when necessary.

3) The roads and other transport infrastructure required to support your proposal would create a completely unacceptable impact on the present highways and together with other neighbouring plans for enormous developments, would cause chaos to commuters and others in and out of Guildford.

4) Flooding at site A46 has always been an issue in the area, which alone makes it completely unsustainable. Even given the best drainage and sewage systems in place, all that water has to go somewhere, so it is common sense to assume that more residents will experience sewage back-ups and other health issues, and some people elsewhere will have flooded homes.
5) On the grounds of destruction of the wildlife that live alongside us in this area, any large development would destroy the variety of wildlife presently living in this area.

6) There is a proposed development for 350 homes to be built at Fairlands-Rokers land, with land given for provision of a secondary school there. So why build a school at Normandy? There is simply no need.

The evidence for my objections comes from information I received from:

- Letter-box drop-ins
- N.A.G
- Normandy Parish Council
- “Write to Fight”
- Various meetings I attended at Emmanuel Church Annex
- Surrey Wildlife Trust
- Other residents

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8006  Respondent: 8930049 / Joanna Sharp  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Further to my letters to Guildford Borough Council of 20 September 2014 and 27 November 2013 (the 1st and 2nd round of "consultations" in the Guildford local plan process), I write to object to the new Draft Local Plan, to remove an immense, and wholly disproportionate area, from the Green Belt in Site A46.

This is an excessive plan, based on doubtful evidence and one which contradicts the assurances we, as residents, were given a year ago.

The new plan, it is clear to all, is entirely developer/profit led - and does not take account of any of the objections raised over the last 3 years’ public consultations, undertaken at vast cost to the tax-payer.

The plan has no basis in the findings of the previous two draft plans. Boundaries appear to have been re-drawn simply because a site is available, not because it meets the National Planning Policy Framework Thus one can assume that:

1/ GBC executive have not taken any account of the objections and valid arguments put forward by vast numbers of Normandy/Flexford residents (and many others beyond our villages who stand to be affected by the colossal strain on infrastructure).

2/ Taylor Wimpey, who, in March 2015 secured an “option” on the land from the owners, the Baldry Trust – are offering such a financially attractive package to a desperate council - that councillors are blinded to other more valid land options in the borough.

This is an whitewash, designed by a developer who seeks to profiteer from the council’s desperation to fulfil it’s housing targets in the fastest way possible, to central government, by way of offering a school to circumvent Green Belt planning law.
To remove land from Green belt "extreme or special circumstances" have to be present. It is claimed that the secondary school (and I notice from the latest Master Plan – also now a primary school) are being “sold” to the community as the exceptional circumstances. Possibly also the 60-bed nursing home.

In Summary: I ask the council to prove the need for a secondary school given the following arguments:

- The area already has 2 primary schools (Wyke, Puttenham – indeed also Worplesdon very nearby)
- Existing local secondary schools are undersubscribed
- Existing secondary schools need Ofsted ratings improved in order to reach capacity
- Existing secondary schools have capacity, and desire, to expand their buildings, facilities and infrastructure
- There is a declining birth rate nationally, particularly in Surrey
- There is a huge increase in Home education
- The Road infrastructure (C16, D60, but also A323, A31) would not be able to sustain the increase in volume of traffic, nor parking. (and this is just in relation to two schools – let alone housing and retail outlets also.
- Public transport links are simply not suitable (for children to travel alone).

There is no necessity for a primary school in Normandy – we already have Wyke primary. Also Puttenham school within 2 miles of Normandy.

The need for a secondary school is also a complete fabrication of the actual situation to fit the convenience of a site put forward by the developer, for reasons as follows:

Both Ash Manor and Kings College (local secondary schools) are UNDER subscribed – as borne out by recent communications with Mr Keith Witham, Normandy’s parish councillor by the Heads of these schools. Both are keen to have their Ofsted ratings improved by help from the council, and both also have capacity to build and expand their facilities and ability to take more students.

The need for either school is simply not in existence – and if the council are looking to the future – the UK birth rate is declining – particularly in the South East – this is universally known and reported.

In addition has the council taken into account the huge increase in Home Schooling?

Current figures published recently show that Home education has risen 50% in Surrey in the past 5 years. 872 children are officially known to be being educated at home, that is 1% of the whole. However there is no obligation for parents to tell the council their child is being home educated, and there is no official national register – it is optional.

Currently, councils are making little effort to record accurately the numbers of children being home educated. So this leads to the obvious conclusion that Home Ed figures that ARE known are conservative – there will be more …. For some interesting reading see: www.theguardian.com/education/2016/apr/12/home-schooling-parents-education-children-england

Even with a further 1025 houses, with the above points taken into account, it is still doubtful that there would be a need for a secondary school. Thus children would be travelling from further afield to the village by car (highly unlikely that they would use the train – what responsible parent puts a primary (and in most cases a secondary) school-age child on a train on their own?) … it is utterly inconceivable that Westwood and Glaziers Lane could sustain that kind of traffic increase, and parking.

Even if 20% (and that is generous) use public transport - on both the East and West access roads of Westwood and Glaziers Lane (classified as C16 and D60 respectively) there are narrow railway bridges which, even with construction to shore up/widen them – will not cope with the increase in traffic.

There have already been fatalities in the past 6 years on Glaziers Lane due to speeding and increased traffic – two directly outside my house. If you wish to have evidence of this, I have photographs of the Air Ambulance Helicopter that needed to land in the field (Site A46) in order to obtain access to Glaziers Lane. If a housing development had been there, there would have been nowhere for the emergency services to access these accidents.
Neither will the A323 junction at Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane be able to cope with twice daily drop offs and pick-ups at schools, and the thousands of extra residents cars. Our local roads and 'A' routes (A323 and A31) are already stationery “car parks” at peak times with massively increased exhaust pollution.

Without the planned 1025 houses, there is certainly no need for a secondary school to be located here – probably however, even WITH the housing there is no argument that supports a new Secondary, or primary school, in the area – until such time as other local schools are consistently, year on year, reaching capacity.

**Alternative local sites?**

In my letter in November 2013, I offered, (as active public comment was being encouraged by GBC) constructive suggestion by identifying an alternative parcel of land in Normandy for consideration for development, being a **large field along the A323 Aldershot/Guildford Road, opposite the former Duke of Normandy pub** (nearest postcode GU3 2AU) Land bordered to the west by "Anchor's Copse"; to East and South by Aldershot/Guildford Roads and to the North by Grassy Piece Copse.

GBC have never responded to this suggestion nor my Land Registry search (undertaken at my own expense via my solicitor). I was under the impression that since the council were asking for public input, they had a duty to respond within 28 days?

I will not re-send all pages of the Land Registry Title on email again, and indeed if Taylor Wimpy’s move to take an option on the A46 land in 2015 is anything to go by, my 2013 registry search may well be out of date now/have a developer’s option on it too now anyway.

Suffice to point you to the PDF attached “**Alternative Normandy site plan.pdf**”, showing in red the edged area of land abutting the Guildford Road/Grassy piece copse which forms part of the land area held under **Land Registry Title number: SY42052.**

This site is on a main bus route, an A-road and in an area not already significantly built up with housing. Distances to services (Doctors, secondary/primary schools) are good/better than Glaziers lane. A secondary school sited here would be in the catchment for both Worplesdon primary school and Wyke primary – thus justifying the 7 form entry size proposed.

Furthermore, there is a notoriously dangerous bend at this point on the Aldershot road which could be significantly improved by a change of infra-structure/highways work to alter the course of the road.

Equally – there are no **flooding issues** (the current site A46 cuts across Flood Zones 2 and 3 – (in the past 2 years all of my neighbours have had No Return Valves fitted from their properties to the sewerage system due to the fowl water coming back up in their gardens when it rains).

I can only assume that the owners of the land of SY42052 command a comparatively high purchase price to site A46 – if indeed they have even been approached by the council or Pegasus consulting, prior to the last public consultations. Though it must be said that perhaps a higher initial land purchase cost would pale into comparison when the extra costs are considered of rectifying the flooding in Glaziers Lane, the fields around Pussey's copse itself, and improving road infrastructure near Site A46 (the land in SY42052 is on the A323 already – a far more major route).

**To Close:**

I am deeply saddened that such a huge development as A46 is deemed appropriate in a Green Belt area; that there is not more creative and inspired thinking to spread housing developments across the borough more evenly in smaller pockets. Surely to identify smaller plots, in each parish, and brownfield sites, would be more sustainable and not overload existing facilities, rather than a "super" site?

That, of course, is expensive. But in the long term – wouldn’t it be worth pioneering a model, a precedent - for considered, TRULY sustainably designed development, even in the face of government pressure. We need houses – but with an eye to a future regardless of immediate financial gain – for the future of us all.
I finish with a my own images of the outstanding beauty of the “Site 46”, enjoyed by myself, my children - many before me, thousands of walkers and not least the wildlife – deer, foxes, partridge, bats, herons, etc.

This is irreplaceable Green Belt Land.

This development would be a mistaken act which, once done, cannot be undone.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
- Response to GBC local Plan July 2016.docx (574 KB)
- plan - SY42052.pdf (4.1 MB)
- Alternative Normandy site Plan.PDF (342 KB)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4160  Respondent: 8933185 / Peter See  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Objection to significant expansion at Normandy and Flexford to provide over 1000 new homes. See pages 22-24 of this letter.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4186  Respondent: 8933185 / Peter See  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Page 229. Policy A46: Land to the South of Normandy and North of Flexford

Objection

Introduction

It is not always easy to be completely objective about proposed schemes in a Local Plan. However, this one (which is a large housing development on the Green Belt next to an existing village) seems to be the worst proposal in the Guildford Local Plan.

Building on the Green Belt

National planning policy requires that Green Belt boundaries are amended only in exceptional circumstances. The need for sustainable development in Guildford Borough is not an exceptional circumstance in terms of the normal use of the English language.

It is possible that a new secondary school has been proposed as a means to obtain planning permission for building a large number of homes etc. However, the provision of a secondary school is not an exceptional circumstance, so it should not be built on the Green Belt in Normandy. New main line railways or power stations may be exceptional because of a national need and their scale and their cost. But secondary schools have been built all over the UK in their thousands and there is flexibility in terms of where and when they can be built they are not exceptional in planning terms. There is
reason to think that a new secondary school in Normandy is not justified. There are spare pupil places elsewhere within reasonable traveling distance and some existing secondary school buildings could be expanded. If necessary, Policy A26 Blackwell Farm, Hog's Back, in the Local Plan, could be changed to include a secondary school (on the basis that the Council seems to think that there are special circumstances to allow the provision of research facilities etc near to the University, on Green Belt land).

This site could look like a new town, viewed from the Hog's Back or from other high ground. Development will not be in keeping with the surrounding area, especially with a Special Protection Area close to the north and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty close to the south.

Building on land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford will reduce the 'green gap' (of only 2-3 miles in total between the existing edges of development) from the urban area of Ash to the urban area of Guildford.

Building anywhere between Ash and Guildford on the Green Belt would be against normal standards of planning which have been followed by Guildford Borough Council and Surrey County Council since the 1950s.

See also pages 5-7 of this letter.

Pollution

The scale of the proposed development will increase pollution, which is already a health risk from time to time. Normandy is next to Ash and the URS report dated August 2014, prepared for Guildford Borough states "Development at ... Ashfongham is likely to lead to negative effects on air quality, noise, human health and other 'topics'. Measures will need to be put in place to ensure that air quality objectives are not exceeded and Air Quality Management Areas are designated".

There is little reason to hope that it will be possible to ensure that there is no deterioration in human health, having regard to the scale of proposed development between Aldershot/fongham/Ash and Guildford. For example, there will be congestion, air pollution and traffic noise for several miles in various directions.

Road Network

There are only two east/west routes to the west of Guildford (the A31 Hog's Back and the A323 Guildford Road/Aldershot Road); congestion and pollution will be at unacceptable levels due to increased traffic on these roads and others in the general area. There will be significant pressure on the approaches to Ash/Aldershot and Guildford. There will be no funds for new east/west routes and, in any case, such routes would be out of the question on environmental and amenity grounds.

Roads alongside the site, and others between Ash and Guildford, are of a pleasant, rural character. Changes to these roads (especially the introduction of traffic signals or widespread traffic calming) to allow for increased traffic, will make them look more urban. Such changes will be against the spirit of 4.5 'Design Policies' and Policy D1 'Making Better Places' in the Local Plan. However, for the avoidance of doubt, there is of course no objection to the provision of low-cost injury prevention measures where the accident record shows a need. Also, roundabouts are usually better than traffic signals at junctions (they help traffic flow and they calm traffic).

New Homes in Aldershot, Hampshire, 4 miles (6km) From Normandy

Paragraph 1.5 of the Local Plan mentions the duty of local councils to cooperate with neighbouring authorities. You will therefore have been aware that for the last 15 years or so Rushmoor Borough Council has had plans for 3000-4000 homes to be built upon military land (brownfield sites). Building work has now started.

This is yet another reason why there should be no building on the Green Belt between the Aldershot/fongham/Ash urban area and Guildford, in terms of:

- the alternative site in Aldershot for new homes
- increased congestion on roads between Aldershot and Guildford caused partly by Rushmoor residents
• increased pollution

• the increasing need to maintain green fields and trees between two major urban areas for amenity, leisure and Csa Environmental Planning, Concept Masterplan Ref Csa/25161101

Although this may be an 'early stage concept plan', it seems to show the provisional intention of 'potential residential blocks' close to Westwood Lane. This part of any masterplan could be unattractive. For pedestrians, drivers and passengers it could be like passing barracks or poorly designed houses of a uniform pattern, which would dominate Westwood Lane. There is a need for homes along Westwood Lane to have their own driveways (see pages 8-9 of this letter). Also, it would be desirable to have wide verges, trees and 'service roads' between the homes and Westwood Lane. They would help to keep the area attractive and dissuade drivers from parking on Westwood Lane.

Westwood Lane is an old road with Westwood House, a property which dates back to pre Elizabethan times. It is hoped that the land (to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford) will never be developed, but if it is, more respect should be paid to Westwood Lane, even if that means fewer homes and a much lower density of development.

**Numbers of Homes & Density**

There will be too many homes (approx. 1,100). Density will be too high.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID: PSLPS16/3836  Respondent: 8939713 / Jane Brock  Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

We strongly object to to the size of the proposed development between Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane in Normandy. Whilst we recognise that there is a need for house building in Surrey, we find it incongruous that such an oversized development should be considered for placement within the Green belt and in a rural location such as Normandy, upon an area which is recognised to have drainage issues. Surely the disastrous recent flooding events of other locations in the UK, should create caution. We object because it is neither a proportionate nor a sustainable proposal as it would considerably increase the local population for whom there aren't adequate local services. Furthermore, the massive increase in traffic from such a development cannot be catered for by the current road system and will create considerable delay and dysfunctionality within the road network, resulting in losses to both the local and wider economy, as well as an increased risk to safety through road traffic accidents and pollution.

Additionally, we object that the locality should be considered for the site of a new comprehensive school when there are undersubscribed schools for this age group in the immediate areas either side of Normandy, at Ash Manor School and King's College. Aside from being an unnecessary and wasteful proposition, a school would lead to increased traffic upon the community's roads which would add further disruption.

We would recommend that developments within a locality such as Normandy be planned in a more sensitive and sustainable manner and of a size that can be absorbed within the community, rather than dominate it.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID: PSLPS16/4876  Respondent: 8960769 / Bernard Phillips  Agent:**
We are writing to formally object to the GBC Local Plan 2016.

Living at a property on Glaziers Lane, Normandy which borders the site between Normandy and Flexford - we will be directly affected by any proposed development of this site.

We understand that the proposal is developer-led and discussions have been taking place with GBC since 2014 to convert this sustainable, currently used agricultural land which is clearly designated within the Green Belt, into a sprawling development to include 1100 homes, a 1500 seat secondary school and retail facilities, doubling the number of homes in Normandy village.

The requirement for a secondary school in this location is highly dubious and must be challenged as it seems that the council is being induced by the developer’s promise to build a 1500 seat secondary school, in exchange for being permitted to build and sell 1100 homes. There is no real case for a secondary school in this part of Guildford’s borough - where will the pupils that will attend this school come from? Not from within the village, even with a doubling of its size. The other nearby secondary schools in Ash and Park Barn are undersubscribed and expansion is planned for other secondary schools in Guildford, so the case for a secondary school in Normandy built on, and wiping out, a large swathe of Surrey’s green belt countryside can only be driven by the profit motivations of the current landowner(s) and the developer.

As the site remains within the Green Belt, it is surprising to learn that, by contemplating this plan, a Conservative-led council would break the election promises of its leadership, which vowed to “always protect the green belt and make sure planning decisions are made by local people.” Clearly, such a planning decision to build on the green belt would not be made by the majority of local people but only by a profiteering few. Furthermore, Cllr Paul Spooner himself is quoted as wishing to ensure “that the interests of local people remain at the heart of all we do.” It is clear that the proposed plan for Normandy/ Flexford does not represent the interests of local people as the majority of local residents are opposed to the development of this site.

Furthermore, the scale of the proposed development is simply unsustainable. There is not enough capacity within the current infrastructure, especially the main roads through the village, to cope with a doubling of its size. As we live on Glaziers Lane, very close to the railway bridge, we feel first-hand the effect of heavy goods vehicles making their way over the narrow, angled bridge. Walking over the bridge is life threatening as vehicles passing over the bridge come within centimetres of the edge of the pavement. It would be irresponsible to propose to expand the village without first having plans in place to improve the infrastructure. The proposed school would also have a substantial impact - traffic would be horrendous at peak times and the effects of the pollution on the ancient woodland and its wildlife would be irreversible. Furthermore, the removal of the wildlife’s habitat would endanger the sustainability of animals that are subject to legal protection.

In summary, the proposed development of this site must be rejected outright as it is disproportionate and unsustainable, endangering wildlife and ancient woodland. It breaks the promises of both the GBC leadership and the conservative party leadership. Even more concerning is that it would eradicate the openness and separation between Flexford and Normandy to create a sprawling conurbation that is completely out of character with the concept of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The University notes the allocation of this 67 ha site as a mixed sustainable development. The University also notes that the site is freestanding in the countryside several miles from the nearest significant urban area and questions whether this is an appropriate location for a new community. It represents a substantial extension to Normandy and Flexford, and its future development would effectively join them up to create a new settlement.

Such a location is unlikely to be sustainable in terms of the ability to be self-sustaining in terms of facilities and employment, given that it is not integrated with an existing large urban area that provides existing employment, services and facilities. It is likely that many residents will have little alternative other than to commute to work and to access many services and facilities, and that much of this commuting will take place by private car rather than walking, cycling and public transport.

In the March 2016 budget, the government announced that garden villages should consist of between 1,500 and 10,000 homes. The prospectus document titled Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities, which was published alongside the Budget, reaffirms this view. It is therefore considered that ‘discrete’ settlements should involve a minimum of 1,500 dwellings, which is deemed the required minimum quantum of development in order for a sustainable development to be of a sufficient scale to create the necessary critical mass to function in a sustainable manner.

The University therefore questions the suitability of the Policy A46 site as a strategic development site, unless other better located sites do not come forward in the plan period.

It appears that the site provides little more than an enabling development for a new secondary school, which could be provided on another site. The need for the secondary school itself seems a little uncertain but it is right to consider potential locations in the plan. For example, should there be allocation of a safeguarded site west of land at Blackwell Farm (Policy A26) as proposed elsewhere in the University’s comments then the secondary school could be provided at that location on the safeguarded land.

The site in A46 is highly sensitive green belt according to the GBCS scoring system, a category that has led to other land being removed from the plan. It is therefore highly surprising to see this land proposed for this use when there is other less sensitive land that could be used. This inconsistency in the rationale for site allocations potentially undermines the integrity of the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7883  Respondent: 8971137 / Woolf Bond Planning (Thomas Rumble)  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

<documents attached>
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  a46.png (571 KB)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7884  Respondent: 8971137 / Woolf Bond Planning (Thomas Rumble)  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

| Our client has a controlling interest in a significant part of the land between Flexford and Normandy, allocated for residential led mixed use development in proposed Policy A46. |
| The site lies mid-way between the towns of Guildford and Aldershot in Surrey. It is bound by the settlement of Normandy to the north and Flexford to the south. The Great Western railway line between Guildford and Reading runs adjacent to the site's southern boundary, with Wanborough Station located adjacent to the south east corner of the site. To the north of the site lies Guildford Road (A323), with Westwood Lane to the west and Glaziers Lane to the east. |
| The site extends to approximately 69ha and comprises a series of medium to large pastoral and arable fields, several woodland copses and a number of small farm buildings. |
| Informed by meetings held with the Council since 2014, our client has undertaken detailed masterplanning and technical work across the entire site so to demonstrate the deliverability and appropriateness of the land for strategic development. Our representations are supported by a Concept Masterplan. Background technical work has been undertaken in order to inform the content of the masterplan, including highway, drainage, landscape and ecology work. |
| The attached Concept Masterplan (Plan No. CSA/2516/11 O/D) proposes circa 1,100 dwellings on approximately 28ha of residential development, equivalent to around 37dph which enables the provision of a range of dwellings types in accordance with the findings of the SHMA, including the housing mix at paragraph 4.2.3 of the Local Plan. |
| The Concept Masterplan shows how the site allocation can deliver strategic benefits for the wider area in terms of supporting infrastructure, consisting of: |
| • Primary school; |
| • Secondary school; |
| • 60 bedroom care home; |
| • Local centre; |
| • Playing fields; |
| • New children's play areas; & |
| • Site travelling show |
| Clearly the provision of a number of key services and facilities on site provides the opportunity to generate a self-sustaining community in this accessible location. It should be noted that the provision of a primary and secondary school has been developed following detailed dialogue with the Borough and County Councils who endorse this site as the most appropriate location to provide a new secondary school to meet the increased educational demands of growth in the western part of the Borough. |
| The logic of the site's location is appropriate particularly due to its location adjacent to a train station that offers direct services between Guildford and Reading. The benefits of the site's location for education purposes are referred to at page 580 of the Council's Land Availability Assessment (LAA) (February 2016). It has been agreed with the County Council that there is a need for a secondary school to provide for the western half of the Borough and that this site forms the most appropriate site to deliver such a facility. |
| In terms of education, we note that Appendix C (Infrastructure Schedule) of the Plan refers to the need for a 7 form secondary school at the Normandy/Flexford site but Policy A46 refers to the secondary school providing up to 8 forms of entry. This inconsistency should be revised so to refer to the necessary 7 form entries. In addition, the policy does not presently refer to the provision of an on-site primary school. By providing 1,100 dwellings, the scheme will necessitate the need for a primary school and we therefore suggest this is added as an additional bullet point. This is consistent with the Concept Masterplan supporting the representations . We therefore propose the wording under the 'allocation' section of Policy A46 is revised as per the below: |
This is a residential lead mixed use development, allocated for:

- Approximately 1,100 homes (C3), including some specialist housing and self-build plots (C3), and
- A nursing or residential care home (C2) with approximately 60 beds, and
- 6 Travelling Showpeople plots (sui generis), and
- Approximately 400 sq m of comparison retail (A1), and
- Approximately 300 sq m of convenience retail (A1), and
- Approximately 400 sq m of services (A2 - AS), and
- Approximately 300 sq m of community facilities (01), and
- A secondary school (01) (up to eight seven form entry), and
- A primary school (01) (up to two form entry); and
- A village green'

The identified need of travelling show persons pitches can be met in part on site A46. The subject site provides one of only two site allocations identified in the Local Plan to meet the needs of this specific group and therefore provides a vital contribution towards defined needs for such accommodation as defined in Policy S2.

It is considered that the mix of uses proposed forms a key element in creating a successful and sustainable neighbourhood, which will deliver a range of benefits, as follows:

- A number of community focal points spread throughout the development, with a natural landscape buffer existing between the two villages so to give the development a two village character;
- Convenient access to facilities;
- Architectural interest created by non-residential buildings, whose status and function will create new local landmarks;
- Opportunity for innovative sustainable building technologies to be used in non-residential buildings;
- Greater opportunity for social interaction due to greater pedestrian activity; &
- A greater feeling of safety, with ‘eyes on streets’.

The Masterplan accounts for the site's existing environmental features, which include woodland and tree belts (including designated ancient woodland) and a public footpath running between Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane.

The new parkland is envisaged to incorporate multiple functions and uses, including new sports pitches, children's play areas, new routes for walking and cycling and areas for informal recreation. The existing woodland, trees and hedgerows will form an integral part of the parkland, providing an instant sense of maturity to the new public open space. The areas of ancient woodland will have restricted access to ensure their ecological value is protected and benefit from 15 metre buffers consistent with national guidance. In total the Concept Masterplan accommodates approximately 29ha of green infrastructure.

The local centre, primary school and care home are proposed to be located close to one another in order to encourage residents to make multi-purpose trips to the local centre. A bus route is illustrated to run through the site, enabling all future residents to live within a short walking distance from a bus service. Further the secondary school is purposely sited on the site's southern side so to facilitate sustainable transport movements via Wanborough station.

The site benefits from a location within walking distance of the services and facilities in both Normandy and Flexford. It is well located in terms of proximity to a number of key services and transport connections.

Clearly, the above service offer will be further assisted by the additional services that would be constructed as an outcome of the proposed scheme. It is further noted that the provider, Great Western Railway, are presently carrying out upgrades to the train line running through Wanborough, which will result in improved services. Clearly the additional patronage generated by the proposed development will only further support the viability of this service.

Highway Considerations
Detailed technical highway work has been undertaken by Odyssey Markides who have identified that the surrounding road network has adequate capacity to accommodate the level of proposed development. Access to serve development of the site is proposed from Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane.

The site is located adjacent to Wanborough railway station which provides frequent services to Guildford and Ascot via Aldershot as well as some direct services to Reading and Gatwick. Two bus routes serve the site and there is potential to divert these through the site to make these services closer for future residents, a matter which can be addressed/funded/secured by means of a legal agreement as part of the subsequent planning application. In short, re-routing buses into the site, providing access to the schools and the local centre, will serve to enhance the sustainability merits of the wider area, including for the existing nearby villages.

**Flood and Drainage Considerations**

Flood and drainage considerations have also been assessed by Odyssey Markides. The site is predominate located outside the floodplain in Flood Zone 1 and is well positioned to deliver residential development in accordance with the NPPF thus satisfying the sequential approach in the SFRA. A proportion of the site in the vicinity of Walden's Copse is located in Flood Zones 2 and 3. However, the proposed development footprint will be positioned outside the floodplain in accordance with the Sequential Approach and in order to reduce impact to the floodplain and flood risk downstream.

A drainage strategy will be developed in accordance with EA requirements including proposals to enhance the existing watercourses within green corridors, dry swales and attenuation basins to ultimately discharge surface water runoff at existing greenfield rates downstream of the site. For these reasons, matters relating to flood risk and drainage should not impede the development of the site.

**Ecological Considerations**

Our client is aware that the proposed residential scheme requires the delivery of a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace to provide mitigation for potential recreational impacts to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (‘TBH SPA’). Accordingly our clients have agreed an off-site SANG provision 0.5Km to the west of the site at Wyke (see SANG location plan attached). This is linked to the site by way of an existing public footpath and enables the efficient use of the site for residential and associated development, whilst providing new walking areas to the benefit of both new and existing residents.

Initial walkover surveys have been undertaken on both the Wyke SANG and the proposed allocation under policy A46 and show that nature conservation interests within the site are concentrated to the areas of ancient woodland, broadleaved woodland, mature trees, hedgerow and the watercourse that runs through it.

**Deliverability & Trajectory in the LAA**

The Borough Council's housing trajectory set out at page 20 of the LAA suggests out that the Policy A46 allocation site could deliver 50 completions in 2021/2022, with delivery increasing in subsequent years. Clearly there is a need for strategic sized sites, such as that controlled by our client in order for the Council to be able to demonstrate a continuous 5 year housing land supply throughout the plan period. Its development credentials have been acknowledged in its proposed allocation and the site suffers from no technical constraints to delivery. The site is controlled by a national house builder, who has secured appropriate off-site SANG mitigation land at Wyke (SANG location plan attached) and is undertaking detailed survey work to enable a timely outline submission upon adoption of the Plan. Consequently the site offers the opportunity for material delivery within the 5 year period and at an earlier date than presently envisaged.

We consider the site could deliver 50 dwellings in 2020/21 and thus propose that the site's delivery is brought forward by one whole year in the LAA. Such an approach would assist in meeting the defined and pressing needs discussed in our response to Policy S2.

**Summary**
Our clients support the removal of the Land between Flexford and Normandy from the Green Belt and the proposed allocation of the land as set out in Policy A46. However we consider that the supporting boundary map should be revised as illustrated on the supporting plan and certain policy wording amendments should be made. These amendments would result in a more effective plan and enable the efficient and effective use of the site for residential led mixed use development.

On the basis of the foregoing, we propose the following changes to Policy A46:

**Proposed Changes:**

- **Land allocation map (on page 231) to be amended to include red hatched area as illustrated on supporting plan.**

- **Wording changes to include provision of a primary school and amend numbers of form entries at secondary school to 7 consistent with Appendix C.**

- **LAA to phase delivery of Policy A46 site one year earlier.**

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**CPRE OBJECTION TO POLICY A46**

**LAND TO SOUTH OF NORMANDY & NORTH OF FLEXFORD**

1. **INTRODUCTION**

As Policy A46 was only added to the draft Local Plan at a very late stage and without prior consultation or adequate evidence, CPRE believes that this whole topic should be subject to Regulation 18 rather than Regulation 19 consideration.

It appears that this late addition to the draft Local Plan was accepted as the result of Taylor Wimpey offering a new school for this mixed use development involving 1,100 houses. GBC seems to have acted opportunistically in accepting this proposal without assessing adequately beforehand how it would fit the policies that relate to the open countryside of the Green Belt.

CPRE has attended two packed public meetings since then at which the Guildford Borough and Surrey County Councillors spoke. At one meeting the local MP was also present. It appears that the whole community was totally taken by surprise at this proposed encroachment onto Green Belt countryside for which as residents they had received no advance warning.

CPRE has enjoyed good communication with the former Chair of the Parish Council and with members of the Normandy Action Group (NAG) over many years. We also have regular contact with the local Councillors concerned.

CPRE has established an additional link to the Friends of Normandy Wildlife since the draft Local Plan was published and have as a result become familiar with the issues which most concern them regarding biodiversity and ecology. We have also visited the proposed development area which is largely made up of Grade 3 agricultural land and some stretches of ancient woodland.
We have subsequently studied the submission that they have made which we consider thorough and professional. We have every confidence that the information in their submission can be considered as an accurate statement as to the current situation with regard to wildlife of all kinds in Normandy and Flexford.

The Treasurer of the Friends of Normandy Wildlife has also made a submission as an individual resident who is a member of CPRE which we have studied and fully endorse. CPRE agrees wholeheartedly with the views she has expressed which we consider accurately Indicate that the proposal is unsound on the grounds listed later in this part of our submission.

1. ISSUES RELATING TO STRATEGY

The massive scale of this proposed development of 1,100 houses is unacceptable and inappropriate as it will encroach on the permanence of the Green Belt and damage the openness of the rural environment at this location by the introduction of high density urban sprawl. The Minister has made clear that housing demand is not sufficient grounds for altering the Green Belt boundary and therefore cannot be considered as "exceptional circumstances" justifying change in this context in the draft local plan. CPRE OBJECTION.

The site is overlooked from the South by the Hogs Back ridge which is located in the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and is also an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV). The Surrey Hills Management Plan to which GBC is a signatory states in Policy LU2 that "Development will respect the special landscape character of the locality, giving particular attention to potential impacts on ridgelines, public views, tranquillity and light pollution."

Policy LUS states that "development that would spoil the setting of the AONB, by harming public views into or from the AONB, will be resisted." Natural England are to undertake a boundary review of the AONB at the Hogs Back to evaluate whether adjacent countryside can be rated as equivalent in quality to the AONB and therefore of national importance. This long standing strategy to which GBC has agreed should be observed and not obstructed.

Westwood (C16) and Glaziers (060) Lanes which will provide access to the site are the rural roads which enclose the proposed development area with the A323 and the railway line. The railway bridge on Westwood Lane reduces traffic flow to a single track. This infrastructure will in our view not be able to cope with the additional traffic which the proposed new development will cause. The draft Local Plan indicates that local highway environmental improvements (which are not specified) would mitigate the transport impact from the development, a statement which we find difficult to believe. However, the Strategic Highway Assessment Report carried out by Surrey County Council on behalf of GBC concludes that the Aldershot Road (A323) which already has little or no spare room for more vehicles at peak times would experience increased traffic congestion. Safety considerations from road accident history do not appear to have been taken into account. Because of development in the Aldershot area in Rushmoor, with more planned for the future, the A323 has had to take steadily increasing traffic as vehicles seek to find a way through to Guildford and the A3. There appears to be no joined-up thinking as to the impact of the proposed Normandy/Flexford development on this deteriorating situation. Proposals regarding more passenger use of the unmanned Wanborough station are over optimistic since passengers wishing to reach London have to change at Guildford. The station can only accommodate a maximum train length of 4 carriages. Access to adequate parking at the station is not at present available.

The sewerage system appears to be already running at capacity and could not cope with the proposed development. Footnote 9 for NPPF policy 14 indicates that development in locations at risk of flooding such as at Normandy/Flexford should be restricted.

The community is not convinced that there is a demand for a secondary school in this part of Guildford. An analysis of vacancies at schools in the Hogs Back area indicates that there is current spare capacity. There appears to be a strategy being promoted in the development sector that building a school in this and other development areas will enable a boundary review to be agreed for the Green Belt on the grounds of "exceptional circumstances". CPRE rejects this idea which it finds fundamentally unsound. CPRE OBJECTION.

The proposal does not clarify which comes first: the extra housing, the new school, the shops, or the infrastructure. It is a chicken or egg story. It appears that GBC has agreed to remove the Normandy/Flexford proposal from the draft local plan should it be shown that the school is not required. CPRE maintains that this development proposal should not have been
submitted in the first place and is in conflict with GBC strategy in many areas. It should be removed from the draft Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6681  Respondent: 8974177 / Nigel Mitchell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A46 Land at Normandy and Flexford

Object

The size of this proposed development is inappropriate for the area.

The addition traffic caused by the development will significantly impact on the Aldershot Road during both morning and evening rush hours.

There are constraints on the proposed development by the two railway bridges on unclassified roads.

The lack of infrastructure in the area needs to be addressed before development commences.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/63  Respondent: 9002593 / Brett and Susan Whitby-Smith  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The need for a secondary school appears to have been the idea of the proposed developer rather than a need identified by an educational body.

The availability of school places I understand is as follows:

**Kings College, Guildford**  The school is currently 57% undersubscribed. The capacity at the school is 900 pupils, and there are only 389 on the school roll (43% utilised) with 511 vacancies.

If Kings becomes fully subscribed, there is capacity on that site to further expand the school, to accommodate more pupils.

**Christs College** is already taking 30 more pupils a year than its admission number, because it has the space and capacity to do so, and is willing to take more still as it has further capacity

**Ash Manor, Ash**
Very much local to Normandy, the capacity of the school is 1,050 and it has 940 pupils, so is **undersubscribed by 110 places.**

There is potential for the school being expanded to take more pupils by 30 places a year (so a total of an extra 150).

**Connaught School**

This is near Ash, but just over the County Boundary in Hampshire - but is also **undersubscribed by 90 places** and available to Surrey children.

**Hoe Valley Free School, Woking.**

This brand new Secondary school only opened last September. It has an intake of 120 per year, with currently 95 pupils, so is **undersubscribed in its first year by 25.** But it will build up with 120 new places available every year for 7 years - making a total capacity of 840. It has no catchment area, and although will mainly serve Woking, will welcome applications from Guildford parents.

**The New Guildford University Technical College**

This is due to open in 2018, and will take 240 pupils from the age of 14 in its first year, and that will double to 480 places, relieving pressure on other schools.

The birth rate in Guildford has fallen over the past two years. This trend may or may not continue, it is another factor to consider.

The local roads are not currently coping with the current levels of traffic, on normal days there are long queues on the A323 & the A31. Days when there are problems on the A3 (not unusual) the whole area is stationary.

Both Glaziers lane & Westwood lane that border the proposed development are narrow country lanes, have little street lighting. Westwood lane has a single carriage limited height railway bridge. The bridge over the railway at Wanborough station is at an angle, effectively producing a chicane. The narrow pavements are only on one side of the roads and swap sides.

The pedestrian bridge at the station is not suitable for disabled access to the East bound platform. The development proposal will give access to the East bound platform. However a passenger arriving on the east bound platform will have to travel almost 1 mile to access the west bound platform for the journey home.

The proposal that both the 1100 residents and the 1500 pupils will mainly use the railway is clearly fantasy.

The stream that cuts both Wetwood lane and Glaziers lane floods the road from time to time.

The Wanborough station access quite frequently floods.

The development in Normandy is so close to Ash & Pirbright Heath lands (THB-SPA) sites of SSSI’s and Surrey Hills AONB that its negative impact needs to be considered.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2342  **Respondent:** 9009025 / Peter Elliott  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**
I also object to the proposed 1,000 houses proposed to be built at Normandy, as the Aldershot road is already severely congested at peak times.

Finally, I object to the local plan, because GBC has failed to identify any exceptional circumstances to justify mass development on the Green Belt, general housing need having been specifically ruled out in the N.P.P.F. as an exceptional circumstance. I Successive governments have sat back and let more and more people drift to the south east, with the result that Surrey is now the most densely populated county in the U.K. Surely any large scale development should go to areas where jobs are more needed, and any houses built will be more affordable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1024  Respondent:  9009153 / Lindsay Mitchell  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.

With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1,100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become even more biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11,350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4,613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh. most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4528  Respondent:  9030561 / Libby Mccarty  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I just wanted to register my disapproval at the plans to build over 1,100 houses & a secondary school in Normandy & Flexford.

I live on the outskirts of Normandy on the Guildford Road, and therefore see how extremely busy already the main road is each day especially in the rush hour, and have heard & seen many accidents, some of which have been fatalities or very serious accidents. On occasions the road has had to be closed and air ambulances have been called on several occasions, which further impedes traffic congestion in the surrounding area.

If every new household has at least 2 cars in the new development plus the added traffic with Parents dropping off and collecting children from the proposed secondary school I am extremely worried on how this will impact on an already heavily congested road, let alone the surrounding side roads which are used as short cuts.

The villages of Normandy & Flexford are not designed for heavy traffic so I believe these plans are completely ludicrous & therefore oppose these plans.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1782  **Respondent:** 9241793 / Nicky Wilson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. **object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.**

With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become even more biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6465  **Respondent:** 9322273 / Chris Waddington  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I wrote in May 2016 concerning the draft proposal to build 1 100 homes, a secondary school and showpeople pitches on land which is green belt land. I feel that my objections have been disregarded in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

The proposed development is enormous and disproportionate to the current size of the village.

Land that is currently used for grass, horses and a smallholding but could be used for more varied agricultural purposes is to be lost to development.

The land in the village is very wet and poorly drained. Development of the scale proposed would require substantial changes to the drainage in the whole village.

The huge increase in traffic that would be generated would require substantial modifications to the current road network, modifying existing junctions with Guildford Road and either installing traffic lights at the narrow railway bridge on Westwood Lane or replacing it altogether. The A323 is already a busy road at peak times with traffic delayed by the lights at the junction with Pirbright Road and the level crossing in Ash. It has had a number of fatalities and other accidents in recent years.

There would be insufficient places at the local primary school so expansion on that site would also be required.
I am concerned that the in-building that this proposal would allow between two lanes (Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane) would soon result in more in-building so that there would be an urban sprawl from Guildford to Aldershot, losing the rural nature of the villages on this side of Guildford.

I recognise that there are sites in the village which could be used for small developments (like those that have been built in the past such as Orchard Close and The Paddocks) and feel that all villages in the Guildford area should be looking to identify such sites so that the number of houses needed in the borough can be shared around the villages.

I understand that GBC is required to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances are needed to justify releasing Site A46 from the Green Belt but there is no clear evidence that there are such exceptional circumstances and there is no assessment of the effect this development would have on the neighbourhood.

The argument for a need for a secondary school does not seem to be substantiated with current local schools considerably undersubscribed. Maybe if the development went ahead there would be a period when such a school would be needed but this is likely to be short term only. It seems more logical to extend school provision close to Guildford to give easier access to all areas around Guildford rather than to site a school in a local village which would require pupils from all other areas to first travel into Guildford then out again.

In summary, I still object to the new Local Plan in the way that it affects Normandy.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
To Whom It May Concern

I would like to OBJECT to the proposed development of over 1000 houses, a secondary school, retirement home, railway parking and industrial units on Site A46 in Normandy.

The following are my reasons:-

1. This is Green Belt Land and this development would ruin rural aspect of Normandy, effectively creating a New Town and this would no doubt lead to contiguous development between Guildford and Ash. I do not see how you can justify 'exceptional circumstances' to release this land from its Green Belt status, especially given the sensitivity of the area for wildlife, being part of the Thames Basin SPA and especially the break it provides between the urban areas of Guildford and Ash/Aldershot.

2. I understand from a local meeting, that if the need for a secondary school cannot be justified then this development will no longer go ahead. I also understand that at present there is a considerable amount of empty spaces in Kings School in Guildford and that both this school and Ash Manor are willing to expand to meet the expected bulge in demand for secondary places in about 4 years time. I use the word 'bulge' as the increase will only be short term - about 5-8 years at the most. You yourselves know that in the last 10 years at least 3 schools have been closed within Guildford Borough due to a drop in demand. It would certainly be a waste of money to build a whole new secondary school 5 - 8 miles from where the majority of students will be coming from that may well end up being a white elephant almost as soon as it is completed, if not before. I would also like to know how these students are expected to travel to this school? I presume most would come by car adding more to the congestion on the roads. Even if you built 1,000 extra houses these would not provide approximate 1,000 - 1,500 children to fill the secondary school on a permanent basis. Can I respectfully suggest that you utilise the schools you already have in the west side of Guildford and improve access to those schools for students from around the Borough.

3. Traffic and roads: Already the roads in this area are incredibly busy for a small village and I do not believe you have any realistic budget to actually improve them in any way. Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane are small country roads and both have significant hazards at the railway bridges. Increasing the traffic volume in these areas will result in an increase in accidents, potentially fatal. These roads are already busy for their size during the rush-hour period and the foot paths are very hazardous for pedestrians as they are narrow in places and are often used by parked cars. Essentially, these lanes are already at capacity, especially if there is the slightest incident on the Hogs Back! The Guildford-Aldershot road is also a very busy road and is frequently close to standstill during rush hour. Crossing this road is already hazardous for pedestrians and cyclists are given very little space. Adding another 2,000 odd vehicles to these small roads on a daily basis + the school traffic would turn Normandy in to a large car park for huge chunks of the day. I know there is a railway station and that you are looking to improve the parking at the station and add another station on the way towards Guildford. These are good aims, but unless the number of trains is increased and the ability to take bicycles on all trains, especially rush hour trains is allowed, then the train does not improve the transport issue at all. On the topic of
bicycles, a proper cycle route is required between Ash and Guildford so that road bikes, mountain bikes and even children can cycle easily between the different parts of the village and the nearest towns.

4. Natural Environment: As you know Normandy is within 5Km of the Thames Basin SPA and as such development of this scale is not permitted. There is a wealth of wildlife in and around Normandy that would be greatly affected by the increase in people, traffic, pets, noise, light and so on. Within the proposed site are some lovely areas of Ancient Semi-Natural woodland – one of the UK’s rarest habitats.

5. Flooding: Much of the land you are interested in developing on already has water-logging issues due to the nature of the soils and rock beneath. There are many properties in the village that already suffer from flooding and due to the impact of Climate Change, this is only going to increase. Building further housing and increasing the hard surfaces to increase the rate of run-off to the small streams that drain the area will increase the likelihood and severity of flooding both for the new homes and the existing homes. Even with the construction of wetland to cope with increased run-off, I do not believe that you will stop the exacerbation of this problem.

I would also like to ask why you are going for such large developments in a few areas which will greatly impact on the character and infrastructure of these areas – mostly things that you cannot (will not?) do much about?

Would it not make more sense to spread the load across the Borough? Perhaps each village/town to get a proportion of the required houses depending on existing size. So Guildford would take the bulk (as it should) and other towns would get a larger proportion than the rural villages in Green Belt or AONB areas. Then within the smaller villages especially, when a large house with land is put on the market the owner has the option of putting this house for village development at the market price. The council could then ensure that each village meets its requirements over the period of the plan by in-filling and replacement of large homes with smaller, more practical and affordable homes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/374  **Respondent:** 10260769 / Keith Witham  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

FROM COUNTY COUNCILLOR KEITH WITHAM

Response to GBC Draft Local Plan Consultation - June 2016

GBC Draft Borough Plan re Normandy - Site Allocation 46 and Site 47

SECONDARY SCHOOL AT NORMANDY (SITE 46-47 GBC DRAFT PLAN)

The proposed site of Normandy/Flexford for a new Secondary School should be rejected as the need for such a school in that location has not been proven.

In its last submission to GBC (July 2014) Surrey County Council, in its official response, said: "A site within the proposed urban extension at Blackwell Farm, with all necessary access infrastructure built in and a catchment surrounding the site, would be a more sustainable location in transport terms for a new secondary school to serve the western side of Guildford." Why has GBC not heeded this advice?

I have highlighted below that every neighbouring secondary school is currently undersubscribed, Kings Manor in particular with 57% of its school places currently unoccupied. The birth rate which rose in 2011 and 2012 has reduced for the last two years, so building new schools now seems very foolhardy.
The addition of forms of entry to current schools will be a much more cost effective and sustainable in the long term if there is a reduction in need – an empty classroom is cost neutral in terms of annual budgets, but an empty or only part subscribed school is unsustainable, having spent £millions on creating it would be a huge waste of money.

Adding forms of entry to several existing schools will see the costs absorbed after the initial capital cost needed to create a few extra rooms – but they still only require one headteacher, one set of staff etc The Head Teacher and Chairman of Governors at Ash Manor School have offered to co-operate with a programme to expand that school, as had the Principal at Kings College - although now undersubscribed significantly, if it needs expansion in the future there is space and a willingness to do so.

If GBC wishes to proceed with this proposal, SCC Education Officers need to demonstrate a clear, and undisputed need for such a school at this location, given the current under-subscription of all the neighbouring local secondary schools surrounding Normandy.

It should also set out how such a school will be financed. If not, the site should be rejected.

Undersubscribed Secondary Schools

**Kings College, Guildford.** The school is currently **57% undersubscribed.** The capacity at the school is 900 pupils, and there are only 389 on the school roll (43% utilised) with 511 vacancies. Kate Carriett, Principal at Kings College has said very clearly and I quote: **"There is absolutely no need for another school in Guildford, its crystal clear".** She also said that when Kings College IS fully subscribed, there is capacity on that site to further expand the school, to accommodate more pupils well into the 2020's if then needed.

**The New Guildford University Technical College**

This is due to open in 2018, and will take 240 pupils from the age of 14 in its first year, and that will double to 480 places, relieving pressure on other schools.

**Christs College** is already taking 30 more pupils a year than its admission number, because it has the space and capacity to do so, **and is willing to take more still as it has further capacity**

**Ash Manor, Ash**

The capacity of the school is 1,050 and it has 940 pupils, so is **undersubscribed by 110 places.** When I met the Head Teacher and Chairman of Governors they told me that if needed they are supportive of the school being expanded to take more pupils by 30 places a year (so a total of an extra 150). They also expressed very strong concerns about a new school in Normandy, just three miles from their front door, and the possible negative effects on Ash Manor.

**Connaught School**

This is near Ash, just over the County Boundary in Hampshire - but is also **undersubscribed by 90 places** and available to Surrey children.

**Hoe Valley Free School, Woking.**

This brand new Secondary school only opened last September. It has an intake of 120 per year, with currently 95 pupils, so is **undersubscribed in its first year by 25.** But it will build up with 120 new places available every year for 7 years - making a total capacity of 840. It has no catchment area, and although will mainly serve Woking, will welcome applications from Guildford parents.

So there are currently **736 vacancies at the nearest secondary schools serving the western parishes - not accounting for the 480 extra at the new Technical College to open in 2018 - a combined capacity of 1,216.** And **In addition to those SCC has already approved expansions at the County School, Guildford and St Peters.**

The birthrate in Guildford has fallen over the past two years. And whilst its too early to know if that trend will continue, it is another factor to urge caution, and not to proceed at this time.
The case for a new secondary school in Normandy is therefore not proven. If there is such a need elsewhere in Guildford Borough, I don't believe it is needed in the location proposed at Normandy.

TRANSPORT AND ROADS

In terms of transport, site 46 is located well beyond the existing confines of any urban area restricting the potential for sustainable travel. The existence of Wanborough Railway Station is only of a marginal benefit.

The area is bounded by the D60 (Glaziers Lane); the C16 (Wanborough Hill and Westwood Lane) and the A323 (Guildford/Aldershot Road).

I cannot envisage any so called "highways improvements" that could be undertaken, particularly on the C16 or D60 that would enable those roads to cope with the increased traffic from 1,100 homes and a Secondary School.

The A323 is already a busy major route, and scope for "improvements" to this road are also limited.

Although I suggest that in any case Highways should consider installing a passing lane, Guildford bound at the junction with Frog Grove Lane, Wood Street Village, to ease the congestion caused by commuter traffic turning right and causing considerable tailbacks. But that is a current, existing problem.

There would be access issues relating to visibility and safety for pedestrians and cyclists, which could be difficult to resolve given that the roads are fundamentally rural roads, and the existing structures of the Westwood Lane Railway bridge and the Glaziers Lane railway Road bridge. The restricted headroom of the Westwood Lane bridge would also prohibit double decker buses from accessing the proposed school.

Rushmore Borough Council - Aldershot development

Local Authorities have a duty to co-operate in making their local plans and I do not believe this has happened. In 2013 the development of 3,850 dwellings (population of approx. 9,000) in Aldershot was approved by Rushmoor Borough Council and is situated about 4 miles from Normandy. The development, over a 15 year period, includes two primary schools, and the provision of a SANG and many other provisions.

The first of these new houses, part of the first phase of 228 dwellings, are now on sale. The land belonged to the Ministry of Defence's former Aldershot Garrison known as Wellesley, Aldershot Urban Extension. Guildford BC responded to the plan in 2013 (ref: 13/P/00108) and in that said that GBC objected to the application on the grounds that insufficient information had been provided to allow a full assessment on the impact of that development on the highways network and said "the impact on Surrey's network and mitigation required has not been established" It its response to that planning application, Hampshire County Council, dealing with Highways and Transport issues, hardly referred to the A323. Copies of those responses are attached for reference.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

A development of this scale, in such proximity to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area, should not be supported.

This is an environmentally sensitive location next to one of the component SSSIs of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area for birds. The Thames Basin Heaths mitigation plan seeks to zone development away from these sites. This results in a 400m buffer zone where no residential development is permitted.

A developer-led proposal driven by commercial considerations does not take account of the damage it would cause to the local environment and the strain it will place on the local infrastructure.

The Green Belt and Countryside Study referring to the importance of the openness of the land between Normandy and Flexford, has been ignored. The current version of the Plan treats Normandy and Flexford as separate settlements for the purposes of Green Belt ‘sensitivity’ but as one settlement for the purposes of ‘sustainability’. This is a double standard
There are many vitally important ecological networks (green infrastructure corridors) that surround the proposed development area (namely Ancient and Semi-natural Woodland, Veteran Trees, Hedgerows, Semi-improved Grassland, Farmland and a Stream) and connect to other important and protected sites within Normandy Parish and the wider countryside (namely Wanborough and Normandy Woods Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI), Normandy Pond SNCI, Normandy Common SNCI (put forward by the Surrey Local Nature Partnership in 2015), Wyke Churchyard SNCI, Little Flexford SNCI, and even more importantly Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA)).

This proposed development would destroy a number of these habitats including Semi-natural Woodland, Veteran and Mature Trees, Hedgerows, Farmland and Semi-improved Grassland, plus would have indirect affects on Ancient Woodland habitat and the Stream through pollution (light, noise, litter and diffuse land and road runoff), predation and disturbance by increased number of cats and dogs (187 cats (cat ownership being 17/100 households) and 264 dogs (dog ownership being 24/100 households) and by people (potential fires and vandalism of trees).

The proposed SANG is only 10ha and will be on land that will be muddy in wet weather and during the winter. Whereas the TBH SPA of Ash Ranges is dry during wet weather and during the winter, plus is either 5 minutes away by car or 20 minutes by foot.

All the habitats within or adjoining the proposed development site are Priority Habitats of Principal Importance under the NERC Act, plus a number of protected species (European Protected Species, Species of Principal Importance and those protected under The Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) as amended) have been recorded within either the proposed development site or 500m to 1km of the proposed development site. These include Hedgehogs, Dormice, Great Crested Newts, Barn Owls, Stag Beetles, Skylarks, Common Toads, Common Lizards, Grass Snakes, Adders, Slow worms, Badgers and Bats (including potential roosts within a number of veteran and mature oaks and other trees across the proposed development site and within the woodland blocks).

Light pollution from this proposed development on this scale would be starkly visible from Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Effect on surrounding woodland and stream habitats that adjoin these roads including the SNCI's of Normandy Common, Normandy Pond and Wyke Churchyard.

Potential adverse impacts on the SPA could result from noise and disturbance during construction and through usage of the playing fields when, in addition, external lighting could cause disturbance to the feeding and roosting patterns of the SPA bird species. There could also be impacts on hydrology affecting the open water and wet heathland of the SPA/SSSI and from increased traffic on Westwood Lane, Glaziers Lane and Guildford Road. Traffic pollution is a major source of nitrogen pollution that changes heathland into grassland and many journeys to a new Secondary School could be expected to be by car.

Prior to any allocation of the site it will be necessary for the borough council to be able to conclude, beyond reasonable doubt, that there would be no adverse impact on the integrity of the SPA as a consequence of the proposed development of the site.

Further work is needed by the borough council to provide the evidence needed to be able to reach that conclusion in respect of the use of the site as a secondary school. The site will require archaeological assessment in advance of any application for development being submitted. I am grateful to Danial Winchester a professional ecologist who lives in Flexford for much of the above information.

It is Surrey County Council policy (March 2013) by a Motion agreed at a Full Council meeting of Surrey County Council about the Green Belt:

**Surrey County Council, March 2013**

**RESOLVED (unanimously):**

Council notes:
1. Surrey County Council has a proud history as the creator of the Green Belt. The County’s Countryside Estate founded by the Surrey County Council Act of 1931 was the basis of the London County Council's Green Belt Act of 1938.

1. The Coalition Agreement states:

‘We will maintain the Green Belt, Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and other environmental protections, and create a new designation – similar to SSSIs –to protect green areas of particular importance to local communities.’

Council believes:

Surrey’s Green Belt, Countryside Estate, SSSIs and other green spaces are vital, not only for the county’s environment but also for maintaining a “green lung” around London.

Council resolves:

1. To use its power to protect Surrey’s Green Belt.
2. To support the National Planning Policy Framework (section 9 – paragraphs 79 to 92) and the Government’s policy of protecting the Green Belt.
3. To make Surrey’s MPs and the County’s Districts and Boroughs aware of this resolution.
4. That any Green Belt development in the County is in line with the needs and wishes of Surrey residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1498  Respondent: 10260769 / Keith Witham  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Further to my email of 29th June I wish to add further objections to the Draft Local Plan regarding Proposed Development Sites 46 and 47 (Normandy/Flexford), particularly regarding flooding and Sewage considerations.

Surrey County Council is the Lead Flood Authority for Surrey, and as such keeps records of all reports made to it of localised flooding problems. I attach a map showing the locations of reports in Normandy and Flexford, and you will see that there are a high concentration of flooding problems in the roads surrounding the proposed development site 46 and nearby to site 47.

Over several years, the Normandy Flood Forum has been coordinating action with not only SCC and GBC, but the Environment Agency, Thames Water and other agencies to alleviate these issues.

But the proposed building of over 1,100 additional new homes and a secondary school would overshadow all previous issues in terms of potential flooding risks.

Parts of Normandy, including the area next to the Hoe stream, have been and are subject to severe flooding problems, and the associated release of sewage into people’s properties and into the Hoe stream which would cut across the development.

The Wanborough Station Car Park is regularly flooded during the downpours which have been occurring regularly.
The Hoe stream also floods, which affects Glaziers Lane at the bridge crossing the stream, and sewage has been released into it, causing a health hazard.

The area of proposed development at present allows natural drainage through the soil and trees; if this area is built on, the resultant run off of surface water would overwhelm the present system, causing even more flooding in the local area.

Whatever any proposed technical solutions there may be, local residents are very concerned that it will not be possible to cope with the increased amount of water and resulting flooding and sewerage.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: [ME-254558_Wetspot information for Normandy and Flexford.pdf](ME-254558_Wetspot information for Normandy and Flexford.pdf) (5.4 MB)

---

Concerns over the tenure of Travelling Showpeople Plots and any lack of uptake on purchase will be due to lack of funds.

Support that the plan is trying to support all members of the Travelling community by providing pitches and plots. The plan shows a huge step forward and it is great to hear of integration of travellers without just securing provision on poor quality land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I write as a Normandy resident and council tax payer. I wish to OBJECT to the Local Plan as far as it affects Normandy.

This Local Plan has been poorly handled and is a disservice to the community. Previous statements to our parish have been changed without reasoning and my feeling is one of being traduced by our Council. I OBJECT to the misuse of my council tax monies.

In particular I wish to bring to notice of those responsible the current TRANSPORT position of site A46.

A

• There are two railway bridges on the perimeter of the current suggestions
• These railway bridges are dangerous with poor sight lines in both directions on each access making four transport risks in total.
• Both bridges have been subject to emergency repairs in the last five years.
• Surrey County Council has been monitoring the volume of traffic in this area in the last year

Hence any dramatic increase in traffic from the suggested site will worsen the existing perilous situation on Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane. I OBJECT to the Local Plan on this point.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
extended journey times in my own experience of 30-40 minutes. The junctions from both Westwood Lane and Glaziers lane which bound the proposed site are poor and difficult to safely negotiate particularly when turning right. This leads to queues building along both approach roads. The delays are worse if there are problems on the A3 and

The platforms at Wanborough station and indeed most stations on the route to Ascot can only accommodate 4 car length trains. Extensions may be possible but at a significant cost to run longer trains. Network Rail can advise whether the infrastructure would support operation of additional services but any changes would no doubt be costly.

Environmentally the site is of great natural beauty and has amenity value for walkers, dog walkers and as an open area and provides part of the break between the conurbations of Guildford and Ash. The views particularly north towards the Hogs Back and south towards the Ash ranges heathland are exceptional. The way marked path between Glaziers Land and Westwood Lane is a popular route. The path and surrounding fields are prone to be extremely wet and muddy with standing water a frequent occurrence during the winter suggesting a high water table that will not be resolved by simple drainage. Buildings on parts of Normandy have been subject to subsidence in the past because of heave and thrust in the underlying London Clay. On a regular walk it is common to see foxes, deer, hares and rabbits as well as domestic farm animals all of which would be displaced by development.

As the developers share price has dropped by some 30% in the last few days as residents we would seek assurance that a clear decision will be taken and acted on and that decisions and plans are not deferred leading to a blight on the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  
- IMG_2723.JPG (2.0 MB)
- IMG_2721.JPG (2.2 MB)
The roads here cannot take anymore traffic, it can take an hour to get to Guildford in the peak times.

The pollution this development would cause is a serious matter.

The loss of habitat to the wildlife, those fields are home to numerous animals and insects.

The loss of our green open spaces, we bought our home here in Normandy to live in a semi rural location as did all the other residents who are opposed to this development.

There is absolutely no need for another secondary school, we are served by Kings college, county school and bellfields schools.

I urge you to please consider the opinions of all the residents in Normandy who are so opposed to the detrimental changes this development would bring. Normandy is totally unsuitable for any further development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.

With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become even more biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6066</th>
<th>Respondent: 10742433 / Carol Booth</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT

to the proposed plans to build 715 new homes, 385 flats, 1,500 place secondary school, a primary school for 420 pupils, residential or care home, parade of shops, and the borough's allocation of 6 showman pitches, 8 flats by the station, and 8 flats in Glaziers lane!

This planned development is preposterous!

I believe all these plans are developer led, without any respect for the villages and the current residence. Both Villages are in the Green Belt, and I OBJECT to this protection being removed.

The proposed development is disproportionate to the surrounding area.

We already have a problem with flooding, and I see no Plans to improve the water and sewage management, and more building on the green fields will only increase the risk of flooding into those houses and buildings.

I OBJECT

to having all this extra traffic on our road system, that cannot cope at the moment, when the Hogs Back becomes congested and the traffic uses Glaziers Lane as a Rat Run. I see no plans to improve the road system - how can they, there is no room in this area!

I OBJECT

to these plans encroaching on the habitat of wildlife. We have a number of Hedgehogs, Dormice, Great Crested Newts, Barn owls, Stage Beetles, Skylarks, Toads, Lizards, Grass Snakes, Adders, Slow worms, Badger and Bats in the area, their homes need protecting too!

I OBJECT

to any further building of schools, as there is no proven need for such. I believe the secondary schools locally are under subscribed by 736! Another 480 places at the new Technical collage, and St Peters have plans to expand. I understand there has also been plans submitted for a secondary school at Rokers, in Worplesdon.

I OBJECT
to the disruption that the construction traffic will have, the continual noise and pollution this will generate. This will lead to significant health issues. No regard has been given to the well being of the current residence.

I OBJECT

to the Green Belt being eroded by large house building firms, rather than for the needs of the local community. There must be brownfield sites that can be used eg:- Woodbridge Meadows, Walnut Tree Close and North Street. It would be more sustainable to build homes in urban areas that already have infrastructure and services in place.

I OBJECT

to Normandy becoming 4 times larger, with a 70% increase in housing!!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2375  **Respondent:** 10742561 / Gary Booth  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to object to the proposal of 1,100 homes, a 1,500 pupil secondary school and 6 travelling showpeople pitches with yards.

This is a disproportionate and unsustainable development and will rip the heart out of the village.

This land is valuable Grade 3 arable and pastoral land. Destruction of our hedgerows and grassland will cause devastating and alarming decline in our bird and bee population.

Our local roads and A routes already struggle to cope with the increase in traffic, which will cause increase in exhaust pollution threatening the health of our old people and children.

There is absolutely NO need for a new Secondary school in this area, when Ash Manor, and Kings College are both under subscribed and have predicted space for the current younger children for the next 5 years!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2029  **Respondent:** 10750465 / Alison Dunn  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I am writing to say that I object to the latest version of the local plan – in particular proposal A46.

I was shocked to hear about the size of the proposed development, given the proposed location – on a sensitive area of the green belt in the heart of a small rural community. There are many reasons why this is just wrong:

1. To double the size of an existing community in one move will have a major impact on people’s lives and destroy the nature of our community
2. Although I accept that new homes are needed this must be balanced with the needs of existing residents and the quality of our environment – surely GBC understands this?
3. If our village is destroyed in this way and our sense of community disappears, I fear many impacts including an increasing crime rate – which at present is extremely low
4. Existing residents may well move elsewhere, changing the nature of this area completely and making it less attractive to the very people GBC is building homes for
5. The development will have a devastating impact on local wildlife – including endangered species – and increase the risk of flooding – which is already a problem in some parts of Normandy
6. There is no way that existing roads (already very congested) can cope with such a dramatic increase in traffic – and the scope to improve them is extremely limited – given that most of them are country lanes and with the restrictions of railway bridges
7. This is a dishonest proposal – going against everything that our local councillors stood for during the elections last year when they pledged to protect the green belt
8. Why are GBC proposing such a large development (in such an inappropriate area) and not distributing development more evenly across the borough which would have far less impact on any one community?
9. The proposed school is simply not needed, existing schools are undersubscribed and have room for expansion. There are few children in this village in need of a school – this seems like an excuse to allow the development company to run roughshod over our beautiful green belt. Profit before people and the environment? Shame on you.

This proposal – A46 – is clearly not properly thought out or planned – and should be dropped from the local plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2167  Respondent: 10772961 / Mary Turnill  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am horrified at the suggestion that Guildford Borough Council is even considering building 1100 houses on designated Green Belt Agricultural land. I can think of several reasons why it is inappropriate, but the main ones are as follows:-

Lack of consultation with Normandy Village to discover what their requirements are.

The flooding problems which already exist, and which cause raw sewage overflows, creating a health hazard; building on agricultural land which at present provides natural drainage, would cause more flooding as the surface water from the newly concreted development flows downhill to the already overloaded drains

The supposed need for a Secondary School, which has been denied by all the head teachers of all local schools who say their own schools are undersubscribed, and who could easily cater for the so called need. Councillor Spooner has said that, should the need for the school be denied, the proposed development would not go ahead.

The increase in traffic from at least 2000 extra cars, all trying to access either the Hogs Back or A323 down country lanes, both of which have hazardous bridges over and under the railway. One minor accident on either the Hogs Back or
the A3 causes traffic chaos, and rerouted traffic trying to use the two Normandy lanes. Should the secondary school be built, the extra traffic in the mornings and evenings picking up 900 children would add to the extra chaos.

The adverse effect on the environment. Normandy is in the Green Belt, and provides a welcome country break between the urban areas of Guildford and Aldershot. It also provides a haven for wild life and the many protected species which exist on the area between the two lanes. In addition, the proposed building site is on non-safeguarded, Red designated Agricultural Green Belt, which according to all the usual safeguards for Green Belt, should not be used for building at all.

Would you please note my strong objections to the proposed development in Normandy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I am not at all happy regarding the proposed development in Normandy.

1) Green Belt land, which is known for its wildlife - birds, deer, foxes and wildflowers will be ruined.
2) roads, the village is known to set gridlocked when the A31 or A3 is blocked. What will happen if you add another 2000 cars. Vans, lorries on the roads, the junctions at Guildford Rd Glasier lane and Westwood Lane can be a problem now.
3) During rush hours its difficult to turn right from willows Park.
4) Condition of the Glasier lane and Westwood lane surface of roads is poor now. Future?
5) Do we need another secondary school? We have 5 in Guildford Borough already.
6) Damage to woodland by construction work - knock on effect on wildlife.
7) Flooding Normandy is known for its high water table, more buildings and concrete will not help.
8) what percentage of new homes will be social housing? We do not have enough in the village. Normandy will lose its appeal as a village to settle in.

A big building plan will be detrimental to the area and should be stopped.

Please stop and consider local Brownsites not Green Belt land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I wish to object to the proposal of a Secondary school in area A46. You have presented this as an "Exceptional Circumstance" when it has been proven by many means including our SCC Mr K Withams that the school is not needed.

So if the school is not needed the exceptional circumstance does not exist.
### REASONS FOR OBJECTION:

1. Site A46 is Greenbelt land. Government policy is to protect the greenbelt. Exceptional circumstances have to be proven in order to justify releasing greenbelt land for development but this has not been done by GBC.
2. The proposal of a new secondary school on site A46 does not constitute those exceptional circumstances as existing secondary schools can accommodate the increase in pupil numbers which might be generated by the proposed housing development. To attempt to justify the housing development in terms of the alleged need for a new secondary school, which in fact is not needed, is a spurious and circular argument in GBC’s plan.
3. Site A46 is a sensitive site of agricultural and ecological value. Other developers have suggested other sites which are less sensitive but GBC has overlooked those in its proposed local plan.
4. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with the consequences of the proposed development in terms of traffic flows. The country lanes which bound it are already overstretched at peak times. From where I have lived for nearly 50 years it is already a risk every time to access Westwood Lane by the single lane under the railway bridge.
5. Also the local infrastructure is unable to cope with surface water and is subject to flooding. Concreting over site A46 can only exacerbate the problems already existing. Building in a flood plane is not sensible policy.
6. It is a principle of planning (NPPF) that local people have a critical input into planning policy. Why should I and I suggest nearly all the local people of Normandy and Flexford have their views disregarded by a developer-led plan of GBC?

### What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Policy A46 – Land between Normandy and Flexford

Response – GGG objects to this policy

Do you consider this section of the plan legally compliant? NO
Do you consider this section of the plan is sound? NO
Do you consider this section of the document complies with the Duty to Cooperate? YES

This land is located with land parcel H12 as identified in GBCS Vol IV. The land is DEFRA agricultural land Grade 3A and has been farmed traditionally for pasture (sheep and cattle) and for grain (wheat and barley) in perpetuity. The land contains many stands of scheduled Ancient Woodland. It is contended that the land contributes to the ‘openness’ of the Green Belt between the settlements of Flexford and Normandy and should remain ‘washed over’ by the Green Belt.

Legal Precedent

We object to the removal of the land allocated to Policy A46 by removal from the Green Belt by “inset” under NPPF para 83 and 84. We believe that current case law militates against the removal of land by the re-drawing of Green Belt boundaries without the express presentation in the written Local Plan of the “exceptional circumstances” proposed to redraw the Green Belt boundary for the land in Policy A46. We draw attention to the following cases

- Gallagher Homes Ltd v Solihull Borough Council [2014] EWHC 1283 (Admin), Hickinbottom J
- IM Properties Development Ltd v Lichfield DC [2014] EWHC 2440 (Admin), Patterson J

In the Solihull BC decision in particular

“Exceptional circumstances are required for any revision of the boundary, whether the proposal is to extend or diminish the Green Belt. That is the ratio of Carpets of Worth.

Whilst each case is fact-sensitive and the question of whether circumstances are exceptional for these purposes requires an exercise of planning judgment, what is capable of amounting to exceptional circumstances is a matter of law, and a plan-maker may err in law if he fails to adopt a lawful approach to exceptional circumstances. Once a Green Belt has been established and approved, it requires more than general planning concepts to justify an alteration.”

We contend that no “exceptional circumstances” for such re-drawing of boundaries have been offered by GBC in the context of the Local Plan process, so how can residents judge the veracity of this proposal?

Guildford Borough Settlement Profiles (July 2013) & Settlement Hierarchy (May 2014)

We object to the use of a 2010 survey of parishes that was not represented to parish councils as to be part of the Local Plan evidence base in an attempt to present the two settlements as one so as to better suit the pre-determination evident in the council officer’s thinking even at this early stage in the consultation. It is recognised in the Settlement Hierarchy that Flexford and Normandy are separate settlements, neither rank highly based on their individual sets of community facilities and services (Normandy 13, Flexford 27 sustainability ranking in Settlement Hierarchy report). It is disingenuous to represent them as a combined community. The ward contains five hamlets in a dispersed area. There is no traditional community centre. The incorrect assessment in the Settlement Profile document has been pointed out under Regulation 18 consultation but the council continues to include this flawed document as evidence. It should be discounted and removed from the evidence base.

Use of educational provision as “exceptional circumstances”

We object to the proposed site of Normandy/Flexford (Policy A46) for a new Secondary School; this should be rejected as the need for such a school in the location has not been proven.
In its last submission to GBC (July 2014) Surrey County Council, in its official response, said: "A site within the proposed urban extension at Blackwell Farm, with all necessary access infrastructure built in and a catchment surrounding the site, would be a more sustainable location in transport terms for a new secondary school to serve the western side of Guildford." Why has GBC not heeded this advice?

Every neighbouring secondary school is currently undersubscribed, Kings Manor in particular with 57% of its school places currently unoccupied. The birth rate which rose in 2011 and 2012 has reduced for the last two years, so building new schools now is a mis-direction.

GBC in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, May2016 indicate that SED 3, IDP p87, a 7-form entry (7FE) secondary school at the Normandy / Flexford strategic development site, requires only 1 FE to serve the development site itself, the remaining capacity would serve the wider area, including Blackwell Farm site (Policy A26). However, given that the proposed Blackwell Farm development is for 1,800 dwellings, on a pro-rated basis of children of secondary school age within the arising population, this would only require a maximum of 2FE. Together, the Blackwell Farm site and the Normandy/Flexford site require only an estimated 3 FE provision. The proposed school is excessive in size, being more than twice as large (7FE) as the estimated need (3FE), and as other information provided here indicates, this is well within the funding and expansion capabilities of existing schools in the western wards of Guildford borough and the western side of the town.

The addition of forms of entry [FE] to current schools will be a much more cost effective and sustainable in the long term if there is a reduction in need – an empty classroom is cost neutral in terms of annual budgets, but an empty school is unsustainable, having spent millions of Pounds of Department of Education capital budget creating it, it would be a huge waste of money.

Adding forms of entry to several existing schools will see the costs absorbed after the initial capital cost needed to create a few extra rooms – but they still only require one headteacher, one set of staff etc. The Head Teacher and Chairman of Governors at Ash Manor School have offered to co-operate with a programme to expand that school, as had the Principal at Kings College - although now undersubscribed significantly, if it needs expansion in the future there is space and a willingness to do so.

If GBC wishes to proceed with this proposal, SCC Education Officers need to demonstrate a clear and undisputed need for such a school at this location, given the current under-subscription of all the neighbouring local secondary schools surrounding Normandy.

It should also set out how such a new school will be financed. If not, the site should be rejected.

Undersubscribed Secondary Schools

Kings College, Guildford

The school is currently 57% undersubscribed. The capacity at the school is 900 pupils, and there are only 389 on the school roll (43% utilised) with 511 vacancies. Kate Carriett, Principal at Kings College has said very clearly: "There is absolutely no need for another school in Guildford, its crystal clear". She also said that when Kings College is fully subscribed, there is capacity on that site to further expand the school, to accommodate more pupils well into the 2020's if then needed.

The New Guildford University Technical College

This is due to open in 2018, and will take 240 pupils from the age of 14 in its first year, and that will double to 480 places, relieving pressure on other schools.

Christ's College, Guildford

This school is already taking 30 more pupils a year than its admission number, because it has the space and capacity to do so, and is willing to take more still as it has further capacity.

Ash Manor, Ash
The capacity of the school is 1,050 and it has 940 pupils, so is undersubscribed by 110 places. The Head Teacher and Chairman of Governors are quoted as saying that if needed they are supportive of the school being expanded to take more pupils by 30 places a year (so a total of an extra 150). They also expressed very strong concerns about a new school in Normandy, just three miles from their front door, and the possible negative effects on Ash Manor.

**Connaught School**

This is near Ash, just over the County Boundary in Hampshire - but is also undersubscribed by 90 places and available to Surrey children.

**Hoe Valley Free School, Woking.**

This brand new Secondary school only opened last September. It has an intake of 120 per year, with currently 95 pupils, so is undersubscribed in its first year by 25. But it will build up with 120 new places available every year for 7 years - making a total capacity of 840. It has no catchment area, and although will mainly serve Woking, will welcome applications from Guildford parents.

Consequently, there are currently 736 vacancies at the nearest secondary schools serving the western parishes - not accounting for the 480 extra at the new Technical College to open in 2018 - a combined capacity of 1,216. In addition to those, SCC has already approved expansions at the County School, Guildford and St Peters.

The birthrate in Guildford has fallen over the past two years and whilst it’s too early to know if that trend will continue, it is another factor to urge caution, and not to proceed at this time.

The case for a new secondary school in Normandy is therefore not proven. If there is such a need elsewhere in Guildford Borough, we don't believe it is needed in the location proposed at Normandy.

**Contribution to the Purposes of the Green Belt**

We object to the express overriding by GBC of the contribution the land proposed for Policy A46 makes to the 5 purposes of the Green Belt in response to a developer-led proposal for large-scale house building in the Green Belt.

The evaluation of the ‘land parcels’ in and around Normandy and Flexford is laid out in the tables in GBCS Vol 4. The ‘land parcel’ that contains the land proposed for Policy A46 is H12, evaluated against 4 purposes of the Green belt it performs as follows:

- Checks sprawl of Normandy and Flexford
- Prevents Flexford and Normandy from merging
- Assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Guildford Borough Council recognises the contribution the land surrounding and within the settlements of Normandy and Flexford makes to the five purposes of the Green Belt in identifying land parcels H10, H12, H13, H14, H15, H16, J16 and J17 of particular sensitivity in its re-evaluation of the land parcels in the Green Belt & Countryside Study, Vol 2 Addendum, Appendix 1 and 2, reinforcing the evaluation in GBCS Vol 1.

**Contribution to ‘openness’ of the Green Belt**

We object to the express rejection by GBC that the land proposed for Policy A46 fails to contribute to the “openness” of the Green Belt.

In the case of Normandy and Flexford, there have been two planning appeals concerning Gypsy pitches (Palm House Nurseries and Green Lane East) where the inspector agreed that land near Flexford and land to the west of Glaziers Lane exhibited ‘openness’. The inspector found in favour of the appellant on other grounds but the opinion on ‘openness’ in those judgements is evidence that the land around Normandy and Flexford is considered by the Planning Inspectorate to exhibit ‘openness’. A third more recent decision at appeal for housing development at North Wyke Farm found that the land contributed to the “openness” of the Green Belt.
Impact on Surrey Hills AONB

The land designated as AGLV and identified as 12-1 in the Map AONB Boundary Review - Recommended Areas for Consideration and pp28-29 AONB Area of Search Evaluation - Natural Beauty Evaluation, Oct 2013 report to be added to the Surrey Hills AONB reinforces the proximity of valued landscape as it will add the north slopes of the Hogs Back overlooking Flexford settlement to the very boundary of Flexford settlement at Flexford Road.

Further, the land allocated in Policy A46 contains unrestricted view of the Hogs Back, part of the Surrey Hills AONB. Recent case law establishes that views out from open land to an AONB are as important as views into land overlooked by an AONB. Surrey Hills Management Board (of which GBC is a member) has submitted proposals to Natural England for land currently with local designation Area of Great Landscape Value on the north slopes of the Hogs Back above Wanborough and stretching down to Flexford Road at the southern boundary of Flexford settlement to be subsumed into the AONB and is currently awaiting ratification. The future potential presence of in excess of 1,000 houses visible at the periphery of the AONB with associated urbanising infrastructure (e.g. roads, perpetual street lighting, general light pollution, loss of ancient hedges and trees etc.) would do great harm to the views into the AONB from the land between Normandy and Flexford and from the Surrey Hills AONB.

Therefore it is concluded that ‘land parcel’ H12 is Green Belt land that contributes to the ‘openness’ of Normandy and Flexford settlements also contributes to the ‘openness’ of the surrounding country side and adjacent Surrey Hills AONB. Consequently, both settlements should remain ‘washed over’ by the Green Belt as stated in NPPF para.86 “If it is necessary to prevent development in a village primarily because of the important contribution which the open character of the village makes to the openness of the Green Belt, the village should be included in the Green Belt”.

Thames Basin Heaths SPA

We object to the assertion that the creation of SANG will protect the rare ground-nesting bird species on this SSSI and Natura 2000 site from major disturbance and predation introduced by the building of 1,100 dwellings that have rise to hundreds of adults and children, vehicles, dogs and cats within 1 kilometre of this internationally important wildlife habitat. Policy P5 is concerned mainly with how to support large scale housing development in close proximity to the SPA than with protecting wildlife habitat and biodiversity. It fails to address appropriate Monitoring Targets for unregulated vectors of disturbance generated from large-scale housing development within the 400m-5km mitigation zone.

Natural England is the government agency that champions the conservation of wildlife throughout England. They have advised the eleven local authorities with land in the Thames Basin Heaths, that new housing within 5km of the SPA may harm the rare bird populations. Larger developments located between 5km and 7km of the SPA may also be affected. This harm can be caused by disturbance to the birds from a growth in the number of walkers, cats and dogs frequenting the heathland, and other recreational uses created by additional housing.

The 2012/13 visitor survey report commissioned by Natural England on behalf of the Thames Basin Heaths Joint Strategic Partnership Board showed not a static or falling number but a 10% increase in visitor numbers since 2005:

- 66% cited dog walking as the main activity
- 80% of interviewed groups had dogs
- 67% of interviewed groups had dogs which were seen off lead
- 39% specifically visited the SPA site was because it was ‘close to home’
- the average distance travelled was just over 2.5 kilometres (80% by car)
Only 1% of visitors accessed the TBHSPA from the Normandy/Flexford direction, so the additional disturbance caused by the building and then occupation of 1,100 homes by 2,000-3,000 residents and 1,250 additional vehicles will be significant. Importantly, the prevalence of dog walking in the visitor survey suggests that the currently available SANG in the borough is ineffective in attracting those wishing to exercise dogs away from the TBHSPA.

Simply claiming that the 2012 visitor study data indicates success of the avoidance strategy in drawing people away from the SPA is no evidence at all. Where is data based on measurement of visitor numbers to the available SANG within Guildford borough? Where is the evidence that SAMM programmes have any impact on the behaviour of residents that are dog owners? This would be more compelling evidence. Without it, a planning inspector has no means of finding the proposal of large-scale housebuilding at these sites sound. In response to an email from NAG, Natural England have admitted that no survey evidence exists of the effectiveness of SANG or SAMM programmes in directing dog-walkers away from TBHSPA in Guildford borough or any of the surrounding local authorities.

A survey of households carried out by a veterinary team at Bristol University in 2010 “Number and ownership profiles of cats and dogs in the UK” published in the Journal of The British Veterinary Association indicates 31% households own dogs and 26% households own cats. Dogs were more likely to be owned by rural households.

Creating 1,100 homes on Green Belt land between the settlements of Normandy & Flexford implies, on average, 340 dogs and nearly 290 cats; all housing to be located within 1 kilometre of the SSSI; for a dog owner, a 2-minute drive or 10 minute walk away.

The proposed SANG schedule in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, May 2016 (IDP, SANG 13 p84) gives indication of neither the physical size nor location of bespoke SANG for Policy A46 (LAA Site 368); it is estimated that this proposed open space will be unable to cater adequately for 340 additional dogs plus their accompanying owners and there will be significant ‘leakage’ onto the TBHSPA.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The area has been registered as green belt and you already allow travelers to set up unauthorized sites and then give up any enforcement regardless of the effect on existing residents and rate payers.

If police are seen in the area the assumption is that they are lost as they are so under manned how on earth would they cope with this increase in residents.

This type of development would turn a nice rural area into a sprawling area similar to Park Barn.

Clearly in even considering this you have no regard for existing residents.

It would be very easy to go on and on but I realize that people very quickly switch off to objections and disregard them.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2135  **Respondent:** 10807841 / Bernard Stutt  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**Schools**

It appears that the development includes a school in addition to 1100 houses. The school is not needed and is purely part of the developers plan to profit from houses and a school.

Detailed research has been carried out in an area around Normandy, Ash, Guildford, and Woking and it is abundantly clear that there is no need whatsoever for another school in the area, particularly in Normandy.

Ash Manor School is seriously understated, and, again has space to expand. The school is operating at only 57% of capacity.

Christ College Schol also has a lot of spare capacity.

Guildford University Technical College, opening in 2018 will take over 450 pupils putting further pressure on the three schools listed above to search for more pupils to remain viable.

All the head teachers in the surrounding area are extremely concerned at the prospect of any more schools being built.

**Roads**

The proposed site is bounded by Westword Lane, Glaziers Lane (and those two roads are lanes) and the A323 Guildford Road.

Westword Lane has a narrow railway bridge over it which separates a give way/one way system. It works reasonably well at present but any further increase in traffic from the proposed development would cause dangerous problem.

Glaziers lane has an up-over bridge over the railway which drives approach 'blind' to oncoming traffic - potentially dangerous. The A323 Guildford Road is extremely busy now at peak times due to the major increase in traffic from Ash, Ash Green, Ash Vale and Aldershot from many new developments.
When there are accidents on the A31 Hog's Back and the A331 Blackwater relief road, Normandy becomes grid locked as it is the alternate route for drivers to take.

Green Belt

In April 2016 the Government said 'There are no plans to relax the strong protection that prevent inappropriate developments on the Green Belt. The proposed development in Normandy is completely inappropriate, would destroy the village and convert it to a small town.

LEAVE IT AS GREEN BELT.

My Recommendation

I have lived in the Ash Vale/Normandy area for almost fifty years. There must be masses of W.D. or ex W.D. land available north of the Pirbright Road area between Normandy and Pirbright which would be highly suitable for a small number of houses.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2623  Respondent: 10807841 / Bernard Stutt  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In addition, I wish to support the Removal of site A46 1100 homes and school, and A47 50 homes and as the infrastructure i.e. roads, narrow railway bridge, sewage, flooding, electricity supply would be unable to cope. Also, it was proved by Keith Witham proved that there was no need whatsoever for a school in this area. In addition, these areas are in the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/132  Respondent: 10816705 / Maggie Cole  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

5. The removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) has left the Plan even further unbalanced against the North East of the Borough with over 40% of the development proposed in this small area of Green Belt. What has Ripley/Send done to deserve this unfair distribution?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
In December 2011 I moved from the urban sprawl of Greater London (Isleworth) to Glaziers lane Normandy. Normandy was advertised as a popular rural village situated within the Green Belt and Surrey Hills. Perfect for retirement, then the GBC published the proposed 2014 plan, which was dropped for various reasons. Two years later the council has now a new plan for 2016.
I would like to express some concerns and objections with reference to site 368....

1/ EROSION OF THE GREEN BELT.
Agricultural land being used for 1100 homes, secondary and primary schools, travelling showpeople pitches with yards and also a nursing home. This would lead to a 100% increase in the number of homes in Normandy. The very nature of the area would be changed from green fields, woodlands with wild life, pasture and arable farmland into suburbia. Perhaps to be renamed Greater Guildford?

2/ TRAFFIC CHAOS.
The proposed site is bounded by Westwood and Glaziers Lanes. These are classified as C and D roads respectively. I will concentrate on Glaziers Lane, although I understand the same problems are in evidence on Westward lane. In the 4 years of living here the amount and type of traffic has increased (few adhering to the 30mph speed limit).
The road is in poor repair with the constant use of heavy duty trucks and double length transporters etc.
The lane has a single footpath just wide enough for two people to cross without going into the traffic.
The footpath on the approach to the railway bridge at Wanborough with the combination of traffic and the angle of the path makes it very dangerous to use.
There would be another increase in traffic from the number of proposed houses and schools with the daily drop offs and pick ups.

3/ PUBLIC TRANSPORT.
At present there are 2 bus routes operating, one at the end of each lane from Guildford to Aldershot (Kite).
The other (520) operated 3 times a day Monday to Friday again from Guildford to Aldershot but this route incorporates both Glaziers and Westwood lanes.
The railway line from Wanborough is a twice hourly service from Guildford to Ascot.
By intimation, in the plan, the council is expecting the public transport options to be used instead of cars.
Does the council have input into the running of Southwest trains and bus services to the extent of frequency and fare levels to attract new residents/users?

4/ SCHOOLS..
What evidence is there for the need of both types of school to be situated within this area.
The current schools are either expanding or are undersubscribed the only justification would be if the 1100 houses were to be built.

The present residents already send their children to existing schools.

In conclusion I would remind all concerned of election promises made with regard to protecting the green belt because once its gone it's gone forever.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1706  **Respondent:** 10818529 / John Hales  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.

With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become even more biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2608  **Respondent:** 10822305 / M.J. Redfearn  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We object to the disproportionate scale of the proposed development in Normandy, it will totally destroy our rural village environment.

We register our objections to the Normandy & Flexford strategic site

Not sufficient thought or consideration appears to have been given to this proposed development within Normandy.

To propose to virtually double the current population is just farcical, and beyond common sense, again confirming that insufficient consideration has been given to the proposed plans, the infrastructure cannot support the current village situation satisfactorily as it stands.

Yes, we have a Doctors surgery, which is constantly overloaded, and with the ageing population within the village this can only put increased pressure onto the system, without any further increase in numbers to the village.

With the proposed increase in the population, this will totally destroy the rural image of the village, which is why the majority of the residents moved here originally.
We moved here over 30yrs ago for the rural lifestyle, the village at that time had the infrastructure to support the village way of life, unfortunately for what ever reason, which makes you think of long term planning, G.B.C allowed this to be eroded away by allowing the majority of these facilities to change to residential use depriving the villagers of local amenities, which itself has increased the loading on the already overloaded road structure.

The traffic situation would appear to have been totally discounted, on a regular basis both the A3 and the A31 are seriously overloaded which is commonly known, and as happens far too frequently an accident occurs on one of these roads, so where does the traffic try to escape to, they try to come through Ash Green, and The Wanborough Hill to gain access to the A323, which is already heavily congested, which then becomes gridlocked.

The government pledged in their election manifesto of 2015 to protect the nations green belt, this needs to be enforced, where are the exceptional circumstances,??? None have been demonstrated, because there are none.

By increasing the traffic through our rural village this could seriously put at risk our many listed buildings along with the road structure, 38 and 44 tonne commercial vehicles are already having a devastating effect on the roads and bridges.

The wildlife habitats within the village need to be protected, unless we do so we will loose these for the following generations, we should surely learn from others mistakes !!!! Act before it is to late.

More and better use should be made of existing Brownfield I Retail sites which are far less expensive to develop, as they already have the majority of services on site.

The planned accommodation developments on the University campus site should be for the students, this has already been approved and apparently has for some considerable time.

Doing this would then release hundreds of dwellings within the town, which should also improve the Councils finances via council taxes, as we understand that landlords letting to students are not liable for Council Tax on those properties, which as residents coping with the ever increasing Council & Parish Tax we consider totally unfair and cannot understand the logic behind it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The council is elected to represent the electorate and have a detailed knowledge of local requirements which affect local opinion.

A developer has no knowledge of local requirements – Indeed is in no way concerned for the adverse effects his proposal will have on the lives of local residents.

His sole objective is to identify a money making opportunity.

Surely the council can only have had a complete change of policy as a developer can relieve them of any of the work and financial commitment involved in the opportunity proposal. Otherwise why now this complete about turn?

You are failing in your duty of for a local community and taken an easy and disgraceful decision

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3203  Respondent: 10835937 / P.A. Robertson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to inform you that I strongly object to A46 in Normandy in the June 2016 Draft Local Plan.

Residents have the right to decide where they choose to live.

I chose to live in a semi-rural environment and not in a suburban area. Normandy and Flexford's 'needs and priorities have not been decided by residents.' This developer-led plan is forcing urbanisation into a totally unsuitable environment.

A village needs to change and develop slowly and gradually over time. Normandy is changing as small pockets of infilling and development on brownfield sites have occurred. Young families are moving in and the age balance is good. There is already a lively community area especially using the Manor Fruit Farm facilities and Normandy Common.

The Local Plan for A46 is totally out of proportion to the current size of Normandy.

It is forcing Normandy and Flexford to become a 'town' divided only by a railway line. Development is not needed to supply village needs. There are still empty houses on the new builds in Tongham showing there is no need for further housebuilding.

Shops and pubs have closed in Normandy as they were underused. Shopping habits are changing nationally. If a 'local' shop was thought viable one of the big four supermarkets would have jumped at the opportunity of the vacant station property with small adjoining car park.

I am shocked that the Planning Department are so weak to think of using Normandy as a scapegoat as one big development saves planning department's time and hassle of a number of smaller developments using brownfield sites.

The Green Belt's purpose is to prevent urban areas sprawling by keeping green, living, breathing spaces open. These spaces are to keep us all physically and mentally well. To remove Green Belt to pacify a developer's greed is WRONG. If a developer choses an area they think will maximise profit, this does not count as 'Exceptional Circumstances.'

There is currently no need for a secondary school as there are sufficient spaces available for the 30 children moving on from Wyke Primary School each year. Such a school would only be needed if the development was forced through. As there is no need children would be 'dragged in' from other areas by car causing further problems on the dangerous, narrow, crowded roads. These 'dragged' children would cause the neighbouring local schools to become further
undersubscribed. Any idea of children all coming by train is unrealistic. The platform at Wanborough is only 4 carriages long. Plans to bus children to school are not feasible as it would need dozens of single-decker buses as the railway arch in Westwood Lane is too low to accommodate double-decker buses.

Environmentally the village lanes are narrow and twisty with very poor sight lines. Glaziers Lane (D60) has only partial pavements. I am forced to cross Glaziers Lane multiple times to simply attend Emmanuel Church in Glaziers ane. During the week I walk my 4 grandsons to and from Nursery in Glaziers Lane. Every crossing of Glaziers Lane becomes a nightmare. Occasionally a car will stop to let us cross but this is so dangerous. A few years ago there was a fatal accident at the very place I am forced to cross over the lane as the pavement ends immediately at a sharp blind bend. This unbelievably is one of the so called access points to A46! How many people will have their lives at risk or die if this development goes ahead.

No more traffic can be pushed onto Glaziers Lane (D60) or Westwood ane (C16). The latest development at Beech Lane (off Westwood lane) immediately adjacent to the narrow, single lane, low railway arch which is also skewed; so very poor sightline visibility is causing many near accidents with the increasing number of vehicles cutting through the village to and from the A31 Hogs Back up a narrow village lane.

Every time there is a problem on the A31 Hogs back or elsewhere traffic is forced down through the village causing snarl ups and fumes. Any traffic problem in Guildford or at the A323 Ash railway crossing causes the A323 Aldershot Road to grind to a halt. Any more enforced traffic would result in total gridlock. Asthmatics suffer dreadfully from traffic fumes.

Both D60 and C16 have narrow, dangerous, broken and filthy pavements. Glaziers Lane cannot cope with surface water drainage after the slightest rainfall water bursts out of manholes and drains which means I have to walk in the lane to dodge torrents of water and mud whilst pushing a pram. The station entrance regularly floods and pedestrians cannot access the station platforms and have to be driven through the water to the platform entrance. This problem was exacerbated by the 2 lots of infilling development along Station Road. Station Road is a right angled bend immediately at the bottom of a blind hump back bridge. This access is totally unsafe for children to access the ‘so called’ safe cycle path (Christmas Pie Trail) or dash to hundreds of parent's cars which would be parked on every available space around the village. School Lane cannot cope with the traffic from a one form entry Primary School. The idea of an 8 form entry Secondary School is ludicrous.

The traffic chaos in the whole Guildford area needs to be fully addressed or the resulting deaths from respiratory problems and road accidents will cause Guildford and the surrounding villages untold harm.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/999  **Respondent:** 10836033 / Katherine Gervasio  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I object to the removal of Site A46 (1100 houses) from the Proposed Plan as it creates an unfair burden on the North East of the Borough, leading to over 40% of development happening in a small area of the Green Belt, all within just 3 miles of Send Marsh.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3204  **Respondent:** 10837089 / R. Robertson  **Agent:**

**Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---
Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A secondary school at site A46 is not needed

There are a very large number (many hundreds) of vacant secondary school places in local schools (undersubscribed), all of which have space for expansion and a willingness from them to increase admission numbers by expanding if there was demand. The nearest secondary school, Ash Manor, is only 3 miles from the A46 site. There is no requirement for a new secondary school in Normandy.

There are NO EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES to take site A46 at Normandy out of the Green Belt. As already stated there is no need to build a secondary school at site A46.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3759  Respondent: 10839265 / S.G. Saxby  Agent:

Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the proposed building of 1100 homes, a secondary school and six travelling showman sites with yards on sustainable agricultural land between Normandy and Flexford.

This will lead to a 100% increase in the number of home in Normandy thus destroying our village and rural environment. The Green Belt land (site 368) is grade 3 arable and pastoral and has not been removed from the green belt. As we are the only remaining open rural area in between Ash and Pirbright heath lands this will have a devastating impact on the habitat of the remaining wildlife. The urbanisation will threaten the rare birds of the THBSPA, which is only 1km away from this proposed development which 2700 people, 1500 cars, 250 dogs and 190 cats. This could have detrimental effect on the THBSPA.

The development will bring chaos to the already congested roads which frequently come to a standstill at rush hour times. New school will add even more traffic and is there any need for a new school? has not been proven.

More homes should be built on brownfield sites. There are brownfield sites available for another million homes plus developers have running permission outstanding for 65,000 homes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3872  Respondent: 10839329 / Frank Saxby  Agent:

Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the proposed development between Normandy and Flexford 1100 homes a secondary school and six travelling showroom sites (site 368). This land is Green Belt grade 3. This will totally destroy Normandy as a village. We already have grid lock on the A232 in the rush hour.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I am writing to object in the strongest possible way to the proposed development in Normandy contained in the draft local plan and named as site A46. The reasons for my objection are as follows:

- The proposed site is within the Green Belt. The NPPF states that Green Belt land may be developed in “very special circumstances”. GBC has not provided any argument that demonstrates these are exceptional circumstances. Fulfilling the housing requirement is a regular, calculable requirement, and there is nothing exceptional about this. The NPPF states that unmet housing need does not constitute the ‘very special circumstances’.
- I understand that underdevelopment in recent years means that there is an increased need for housing in the new local plan. This cannot justify ‘very special circumstances’. If it did, local authorities would be incentivised to create peaks and troughs in order to circumvent planning regulations. GBC must plan the current housing need within the framework that would have been available to it had there been no backlog.
- The size of the proposed development is disproportionate to the size of the village. I understand that Normandy’s current population is 2300. Adding an additional 1200 households would double the size of the population, permanently destroying the character of the village.
- The proposed development ignores my right to live in a rural environment. I chose to live here because of its rural nature, green surroundings, access to countryside and small size. The proposed development would permanently destroy all these characteristics.
- GBC’s SHMA does not provide methodology for its calculation of housing need. When responding to a FOIA request, it replied that the algorithm underpinning the calculation was outsourced to a private company and is therefore private IP. This is immoral, in addition to making the calculation ineligible for consideration in the planning process. GBC has a public duty to show how the housing need has been calculated and it is a moral outrage to claim that the workings cannot be disclosed. This significant public decision must be within the public domain. If the model cannot be disclosed then it cannot be relied upon as part of GBC’s evidence.
- The SHMA does not demonstrate consideration of reduced population growth, and also assumes a level of immigration that now may not arise in the current political climate.
- There is no demonstrated need for a secondary school in Normandy. Local schools such as Kings School and Ash Manor are significantly undersubscribed, and an additional new school is being built in Mayford. Furthermore, the demographics of Normandy shows a skew towards an older population who have no current or future need for this amenity. The proposed school in particular does not take into account the needs of the local community.
- GBC has not maximised development of brownfield sites before proposing to build on green belt. Nor has GBC taken steps to ensure that all urban sites are in full use before destroying the green belt. Only 2742 homes are planned in Guildford, an urban area with far greater capacity for absorbing new housing than its surrounding small villages and green belt.
- The local plan demonstrates a preference for large scale developments with significant impact on local areas instead of multiple smaller developments whose impact would be less harmful overall. GBC has a public duty to minimise the harmful impact of proposed development and a greater number of smaller developments would be less impactful than the proposed large scale developments. It is fairer overall to spread development through the
region rather than to select three areas to permanently destroy, which has perhaps happened because this offers
less work and less resistance for the council. This is not in the public interest.

- Finally, I have significant concerns about traffic. I live on the A323 and at peak times it often takes me an
unacceptable amount of time to pull out of my driveway, or to queue on the main road before I reach home. I do
not believe that this road has the capacity to cope with the additional volume of traffic the proposed
development would bring. Furthermore, additional traffic from the new development in Aldershot has yet to be
taken into consideration. We also have a major problem with speeding on this road, which I think will be
exacerbated by the development. Glaziers lane will be perceived as the local road serving the development, and
the Guildford Road will be perceived as the end of the built up area, so that drivers will be even less likely to
adhere to the speed limit.

I trust that these points will be given due consideration as part of the consultation process.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3427  Respondent: 10847585 / Sean Meharg  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Land to the South of Normandy and North of Flexford

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5798  Respondent: 10847937 / Fal Khairuddin  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

School

The case to build a secondary school at this location is not proven in fact the opposite is true. My understanding is, Ash
Manor and King's College in Surrey are undersubscribed. It will be the proposed housing that is driving the need not the
other way round.

Does an unneeded school in this area provide enough "exceptional circumstance" to remove our land from the
metropolitan green belt? It should be built elsewhere in the borough where the need already exists.

Traffic

The railway bridge immediately outside my property is already a dangerous nightmare with the oncoming traffic blind
spot.

With this new proposed development where even a small estimate will generate 1500 cars let alone extra traffic drawn
here for the proposed school and shops.

The bridge is only single vehicle access and will cause traffic at either side of the road to get through.

The junction at the A323 at Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane is already difficult to turn right and the additional
proposed  traffic makes it unsustainable.
Glaziers Lane is an unclassified road (D60) and Westwood Lane and Wanborough Hill are only C16 classified road, therefore the roads are not up to handling the additional expected traffic.

Rural environment

This proposal will increase Normandy population by 100% ripping apart the 'ruralness' of our village and changing its character and makeup.

I hope you take note of the wishes of the majority of the village and reconsider these proposals. Please do not underestimate the power of the people in Normandy and mistake it as an easy and soft target to just build a 'new town' here.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/151  Respondent: 10848513 / Martin Cole  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- The removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) has left the Plan even further unbalanced against the North East of the Borough with over 40% of the development proposed in this small area of Green Belt. What has Ripley/Send done to deserve this unfair distribution?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6627  Respondent: 10855201 / Mary-Ann Witherington  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Conservation of our environment, habitats and declining species and flora and fauna.

The proposed ‘Local Plan’ will have a negative effect on our environment. In recent years there have been serious declines in many species of flora and fauna due to the increase in human population and all that it brings, e.g. Disturbance, air and noise pollution, litter, vandalism, predation by pets.

The site lies within the Green Belt, all habitats within or adjoining A46 are Priority Habitats under the NERC Act and have European Protected Species. This plan will also impact on views from the AONB.

Highways, traffic congestion.

I live on the Guildford Road and it is already very busy and at peak times morning and evening it is very congested. Traffic is queuing every Monday to Friday at peak times. The proposed ‘Local’ would increase traffic on the Guildford Road causing potentially more accidents ( which have happened close to my house ) and an increase in air and noise pollution. I have not seen any evidence that GBC have produced a successful method of easing congestion on the Guildford Road in conjunction with the proposed ‘Local Plan’.
Local secondary School.

The local secondary schools have been contacted by our Parish councillor’s and their Head teachers have said their schools are under subscribed, so we do not need another secondary school.

GBC’s consultation on the Local Plan was based on the proviso that policy A46 was to be deleted in the absence of justification for the location of a secondary school at the site. The Parish Council has seen no proper justification for the location of a secondary school in this Green Belt site. The selection of the site appears to have been justified on the basis that it will be close to the housing identified in the allocation.

My final thoughts.

I think our ‘Local Plan’ needs to reflect the views of Normandy and local area residents much more closely. The current proposed ‘Local Plan’ includes building over 1,100 houses which in my opinion is far too many.

I realise there may be a need for affordable homes but I strongly object to large scale house building in rural settings like Normandy and Flexford.

If there is a justification for affordable housing in the Guildford area then I would conclude that the people to whom the houses are intended are likely to be working in Guildford centre or close to it. There is no large scale employment in Normandy.

Therefore why can’t GBC get more creative and fully utilise brown field sites in urban areas and consider building attractive low level flats? This will also aid traffic congestion into Guildford as those that live and work in and round Guildford are more likely to use the bus or walk to work.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
There is a failure to engage with Rushmoor under the duty to co-operate rules in regards of traffic impact from Aldershot Urban Extension (3,800 homes) The increased commuting to Guildford plus new local vehicles (1,375 estimated) will take the A323 to over design capacity and produce perpetual congestion.

The one railway bridge in Glaziers Lane + 1 railway tunnel in Westwood Lane on North Downs line are restricted (tunnel single lane) with poor geometry and have poor safety records with one fatality in last 15 years and there is no plan in the infrastructure report to widen bridge or replace tunnel (Network Rail). This will lock traffic from new development within site to the north of Flexford. C and D class roads are not designed for volumes indicated in Scenario 5.

The flood risk will be significantly increased when land is developed. The site lies on the Hogs Back spring line and the land is natural SuDS. There is a stream running through the site with flood risk 3a. Civil engineering mitigation is unlikely to be effective.

The site will introduce 300+ dogs and 250+ cats within 1km of TBHSPA and SANG will not stop increased disturbance and predation on the SPA.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5107  Respondent: 10859969 / R C Pike  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to register my objection to the removal of green belt status of the land in Normandy (A 46) to facilitate the proposed development.

Schools in the area have spare capacity to take many more pupils and are prepared to expand their existing sites.

The roads in the locality are already overloaded and regularly jam during peak hours. The increase in traffic due to the school, housing and lorries from the travellers site would be massive.

The main sewer running across the area overflows raw sewage from the manholes in winter exacerbated by frequent flooding at times of high rainfall.

Site A46, the land between Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane is productive farmland with hedges, ancient woodland and hay meadows supporting a diverse range of wildlife which would be decimated by this development.

With the proposed building to the West of Guildford (Blackwell Farm etc.) there would be almost continuous urbanisation to Aldershot changing the rural character of Normandy and Flexford forever.

Removal of the land(A46) from the greenbelt is unnecessary and cannot be justified. Developing smaller sites around the locality would be a better solution to satisfy the need for new housing.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2508  Respondent: 10861441 / Peter Read  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I feel that more investigation in finding small scale developments in this village and others in the surrounding area us the use of brown field sites would make unnecessary such a large scale developmet with all its attendant damage to the rural ife and its residents.

* I am led to bel eve by Surrey Council Traffic simulations, that the roads serving this village are judged to be above their designed capacity.

Dangerous junctions at Glaziers tt Westwood Lanes with Aldershot Road A323

Steep,winding road from Wanborough Hill to junct on with Aldershoot road which also has a very narrow one-vehicle bridge

init. This road and others are used heavily during peak times and during A3 tt A31 closures.

Hump bridge in Glaziers Lane with dangerous blind station entrance.

90 degree sharp bend at Glaz ers Lane and Flexford Lane junction. These are minor lanes, tree-linedin many places with inconsistent footpaths.

The station has only a half hour service, a very small car parking area,is unmanned and has no disabled access to Guildford trains. The station car parking is already causing long term parking in the residential roads nearby.

Medical centre is inadequate for proposed development

If the proposed plan were to be carried out, all or most of these infrastructure points would have to be addressed at considerable cost and upheaval. Even then the character and lfe of the village would be destroyed makingit for allintents and purposes a small town.

• I had been assured that the Green Belt status of this site was safe guarded and no Exceptional Circumstance had been

• With more selective planning a school of the proposed size would not be needed here.

• I fear this plan will do permanent damage to the wildlife and green areas that surround us.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3355</th>
<th>Respondent: 10861441 / Peter Read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I SUPPORT the removal of site A46 - 1,100 homes and school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1854</th>
<th>Respondent: 10861569 / Christine Read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to the Guildford Borough Council Local Plan for Development in Normandy Parish.

I OBJECT to the proposed 146 plan on the following basis.

* the plan is on such a huge scale that it is insensitive to the needs and requirements of this rural area and its residents. Although it is appreciated that more housing is required this plan will totally destroy our neighbourhood.

* insufficient investigation in providing smaller scale developments in this and all other surrounding developed areas and brown field sites.

* the road infrastructure of this area is already stressed at peak times and in its present form it could not support any increase. The level of traffic on our roads has I understand, been judged as above the capacity for which they were designed (see Surrey County traffic simulations).

Dangerous hump bridge and bend in Glaziers Lane

Single Vehicle arch bridge in Westwood Lane

Both of these are minor country lanes not major roads.

Dangerous entrance to station.

Insufficient station car parking

Station inadequate - no disabled access to Guildford platform.

Infrequent train service

Insufficient footpaths on both Glaziers and Westwood Lanes

Difficult exit to and from both Glaziers & Westwood Lanes to Aldershot Road (A323).

Medical centre too small for proposed development

Winding access road from Wanborough Hill which is heavily used as an escape route from A31 & A3 during peak periods and road closures.

ALL the above points need to be improved or rectified prior to building the proposed development. It is understood that no funding has been confirmed for this work.

*large scale building on the existing Green Belt is unacceptable and no 'Exceptional Circumstances' have been demonstrated. It is only the plan to build this huge development that makes a new school necessary in this area. It could be sited where there is an existing requirement and suitable infrastructure.

* Insufficient care, planning and consideration for the protection of wildlife and the unique special green spaces in this area.

* confusing applications to various committees resulting in inadequate consultation of residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSED A46 PLAN ON THE FOLLOWING BASIS.

The plan is on such a huge scale that it is insensitive to the needs and requirements of this rural area and its residents. Although it is appreciated that more housing is required this plan will totally destroy our neighbourhood.

Insufficient investigation in providing smaller scale developments in this and all other surrounding developed areas and brownfield

The road infrastructure of this area is already stressed at peak times and in its present form it could not support any level of traffic on our roads has I understand, been judged as above the capacity for which they were designed (see Surrey Council traffic simulations)

Dangerous hump bridge and bend in Glaziers Lane Single vehicle arch bridge in Westwood Lane

Both of these are minor country lanes not major roads. Dangerous entrance to station.

Insufficient station car parking

Station inadequate - no disabled access to Guildford platform. Infrequent train service

Insufficient footpaths on both Glaziers and Westwood Lanes. Difficult exit to and from both Glaziers & Westwood Lanes to Aldershot Road (A323).

Medical centre too small for proposed development

Winding access road from Wanborough Hill which is heavily used as an escape route from A31 & A3 during peak periods and road closures.

ALL the above points need to be improved or rectified prior to building the proposed development. It is understood that no funding has been confirmed for this work.

Large scale building on the existing Green Belt is unacceptable and no 'Exceptional Circumstances' have been

It is only the plan to build this huge development that makes a new school necessary in this area. It could be sited where there is an existing requirement and suitable infrastructure.

Insufficient care, planning and consideration for the protection of wildlife and the unique special green spaces in this

Confusing applications to various committees resulting in inadequate consultation of residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp172/3342  Respondent: 10861569 / Christine Read  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I fully SUPPORT the removal of site A46 from the Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLP16/6125  Respondent: 10866465 / Judy and Robert Hatfield  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We have lived in Normandy for 25 years and like the rural rambling nature of the village. We appreciate the rural atmosphere and the green spaces with close proximity to a wonderful town, Guildford. It is a thriving community with many social activities and clubs. Normandy is situated between Guildford, Farnham and Aldershot and building a significant number of houses in Normandy would mean that the 3 towns would begin to merge into one large metropolis (Guildhamshot?!). We did not move here to live in a new town with 1,100 new houses to be built. Surely brown sites should be considered first?

From the ridge of Ash ranges (SSI) looking South there is a fantastic view of the Hogs back (very famous landmark) with Guildford cathedral just visible to the South East. The view is primarily green, mainly trees and fields with very few houses visible. Building 1,100 house between Wyke and Christmas pie would destroy this view and have a detrimental effect on those who get pleasure walking/riding on the ranges.

We think that as a matter of principle, green belt should remain green belt. To us, having been told by councillors that our new policy is to protect the green belt, we have been led into thinking that Normandy is safe from development. However, we are now told that this no longer applies if a Secondary school is built. Where did the need for a Secondary school come from? From what I am told and presumably you can check this out, there is no need for a secondary school in Normandy as existing schools in the surrounding areas, such as Ash Manor, are not full. It seems to us that a Secondary school is only being proposed as a means of building houses - to us this does not seem right.

The traffic around Normandy has increased considerably since we have moved here and the number of traffic accidents seems to have risen significantly. Trying to get out of my drive (on the Pirbright Road) can be difficult at times (we sometimes even question whether traffic lights are appropriate for our drive). With the proposed new houses, the situation will only get worse and in my mind could lead to even more safety issues.

We hope you will not approve building 1100 houses on Green Belt when there is no justification for it, especially when there are brown sites that are not being considered first.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6571  Respondent: 10874017 / Diane and Tony Cuff  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
We object to the ‘large strategic site’ approach to meet the housing needs where these sites have such an overwhelming visual impact on the local area. (NPPF 11 stated purpose: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment).

Boarding the North Downs AONB, Policy sites A26 and A46 would be very noticeable developments and easily seen both day and night. (Design Policies- Policy D4: Development in urban areas and inset villages).

‘Brown field sites’ and ‘land-banked sites’ must be fully utilised before any erosion of Green Belt is considered. (NPPF stated purpose).

We disagree with the current SHMA document being used as basis for housing needs. University student accommodation appears to distort housing needs. Brexit may influence the university student numbers.

The approach of making small adjustments to the settlement areas of each village and town, throughout the borough, should be strongly considered. Small developments can be absorbed easily within the existing area with very little effect on the environment, visual impact, transportation needs and all the supply services. The addition of small numbers of residents can easily integrate into the community and lead to a stronger more vibrant society.

We object most strongly to the proposed development designated ‘Policy A46 Land to south of Normandy and north of Flexford’. This is a developer led proposal that is totally out of scale to the surroundings.

Normandy and Flexford are small countryside villages. There is not the infrastructure to support the proposed 70% to 100% increase in housing development. Normandy and Flexford should be considered as separate residential areas. Creating such a large block of housing would totally destroy the easy open nature of the villages.

We object to the proposed new secondary school as two of the nearest local schools are under subscribed. A new school with 1500 places away from the main catchment areas would mean the majority of students travelling into Normandy and undoubtedly a large percentage would use the car for convenience. St. Peters and County schools have approved expansions. Expansion to the closest existing schools would be a far more cost effective solution. (NPPF stated purpose). The access roads to/from the proposed development are the C16 Westwood Lane and D60 Glaziers Lane. These roads will not cope with the additional car movements from ‘school runs’ and residents work travel during peak hours. Westwood Lane has a dangerous single lane railway bridge with limited headroom and Glaziers Lane has an angled hump backed bridge. These two roads feed onto A323 Aldershot Road to the north and the A31 Hogs Back to the south. Both these roads are notorious for their queuing at peak times.

It is an unacceptable practice for a developer to use the inclusion of a school as a ‘sweetener’ to justify commercial interests.

The massing of the proposed development does not relate to the existing open nature of Normandy village. (Design Policies- Policy D4: Development in urban areas and inset villages).

We object that this developer lead proposal gives no consideration to the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas. (NPPF stated purpose).

We object to the creation of a development corridor from Guildford to Aldershot (Waverley) boundary along the A323. It would be devastating to nature and the environment. We must prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another. (NPPF stated purpose)

Normandy should have limited development to secure nature conservation interests and retain the attractive landscape between the urban areas of Guildford and Aldershot. This proposal lies within the zone of protection to the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area so consideration must be given to its protection.

We object that this proposal gives no consideration to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. (NPPF stated purpose).
This site is not 'grassland' as stated. It is using viable class 3 agricultural land that must be maintained and used to help feed the growing national population. As a nation we cannot and must not rely on imported products, they will become unsustainable and unaffordable.

The roads, the electrical, gas, telecommunications and water supply and drainage are constantly under strain to maintain current levels of demand. Breakdown of supply is frequent. With the added hard standing and reduction of natural water soak away flooding will be far worse than present levels.

Health care and emergency services are at full capacity.

The settlement areas of Normandy and Flexford should be as deemed by the existing properties. We object to any major change.

The Core planning principle that planning be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings must be considered.

We must not use a convenient cheapskate option today that our children and future generations will pay heavily for and never recover from.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3973  **Respondent:** 10877441 / M.K. Llanwarne  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**Guildford Local Plan: Normandy/Flexford Strategic Site-Policy A46**

I have lived in Normandy for 45 years and I strongly object to the proposed development on the above Green Field site. I fully accept that more houses are needed throughout the borough but I am horrified at the massive development proposed for this site which will completely destroy our rural environment.

We are advised that a 7FE secondary school is needed in the west of the Borough and that the provision of such a school would constitute "exceptional circumstances" that are required to remove the land from the Green Belt. This site is Grade 3 arable and pastoral land with important flora and fauna and is only 1 km away from the Thames Basin Heaths and a large development could have a detrimental effect on the TBHSPA. The site was stated by Councillor Spooner at our Parish Council Meeting in February to have "red Sensitivity".

School

Is the school actually needed? I know that Keith Witham our Surrey County Councillor has carried out detailed research and I understand that Surrey Education Department have unfilled secondary places in the west of the borough in the medium term to cater for over 700 children and other schools are willing to expand. The Council has no doubt been provided with all the details of Keith Witham's research. If these figures are correct why should children have to travel to Normandy by train, bus or car when they have schools near to them?

In my opinion the school is not required and following Councillor Bilbe's amendment to the draft Local Plan at the Planning Meeting on 24th May the strategic site in Normandy should be excluded in its entirety. This view is strongly felt by many residents as you are no doubt aware. However if our views are ignored will you also consider the following points:
Roads/Traffic Chaos

This development would link up to roads classified as C16 (Westwood Lane and Wanborough Hill) and D60 (Glaziers Lane-unclassified road). I live opposite a small nursery school with cars parked outside in Glaziers Lane when the children are dropped off and collected by their parents and this will be increasingly dangerous initially with contractors' vehicles going up and down to the site. Because of my age I no longer drive but I am aware from my carers who have to come each day and neighbours that the local roads grind to a halt at peak times and increased traffic from the houses proposed and a huge secondary school with daily drop off and pick-ups would make the situation untenable. Westwood Lane with a low railway bridge and one way traffic would not be viable for big lorries etc during the building stages which would force heavy traffic from A31 and A323 onto Glaziers Lane which has a narrow railway bridge over the railway line and in addition large vehicles coming off A323 have to come across both lanes as they turn into Glaziers Lane which creates a dangerous situation for vehicles going onto or crossing the A323. I recall too that in recent years Glaziers lane has had problems with subsidence on the corner coming off the A323. Would it not be at enormous risk with the heavy increase of traffic especially contractors vehicles etc?

Flood Risk/Sewage

Normandy/Flexford has a very high water table with rain water draining down from the Hogs Back and from the Ash Ranges and flooding in wet periods is a frequent occurrence throughout the village so with a vastly increased population the sewer system and drainage are a major concern. You will see that I live at 116 Glaziers Lane, backing onto the proposed site and my neighbours and I suffer from significant amounts of laying water particularly in wintertime. From my own experience I lost a large tree last winter as its roots were completely waterlogged. With the extensive building proposed the problems will undoubtedly increase with a risk of subsidence.

Conclusion

If the development, as proposed, went ahead it would double the size of the village and would further increase the risk of flooding. There is no way the existing infrastructure could support if with regard to roads(without 2 new railway bridges and traffic lights to get onto or across the A323), drainage, sewage, worries with an overhead electricity supply and the very high water table. All vast problems.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The current surroundings are beautiful and very enjoyable, the green countryside should not be spoilt. Please don't let that happen.

To be clear I strongly object to the proposals to develop the land shown as Site A46 in the draft Local Plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4081</th>
<th>Respondent: 10895233 / Val and Geoff Glassup</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( )</td>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong> ( )</td>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I strongly object to the release of Site A46 from the Green Belt. I base my objection on the following:-

1. I consider that the Borough is already overcrowded and that the massive development proposals in the whole of the Plan will greatly detract from the future enjoyment of living in the Borough.

2. I object in general to the release of large areas for development, particularly away from the main urban area of Guildford, because of the huge undesirable change in the character of those areas it will cause, and the difficulty of integrating so many new people in a short time.

3. I object to new large areas for development being proposed which have little or no.

4. I object in particular to the massive development proposed in site A46 (Normandy/Flexford) and A29 (Ash/Tongham) because these areas are already overcrowded in terms of movement, especially in the centres of Glaziers Lane, Normandy, Ash Street, and Ash Wharf.

5. I object to, what will in effect be, the creation of two villages with two centres if the massive proposals for A46 go ahead.

Regarding the overcrowding of the Borough as a whole, it is plain to see that in terms of travel we have reached a point where during the extended peak times there is undesirable congestion at a huge number of locations. In many of these there is little that can be done in the short or medium term to alleviate this. Major schemes such as the A3 improvement through Guildford will take decades to come to fruition and yet they are needed now even without the massive new development proposed across the Borough.

Regarding the release of large areas, I think it is unreasonable to impose such significant and dramatic changes on local people in rural areas which would take place over such a short time. Established communities have a character of their own and in my view it is unreasonable to impose change that would make the locality unrecognisable.

Regarding the history of development proposals I think it is unreasonable to suddenly come up with a proposal to virtually double the size of a village such as Normandy where development of this magnitude has really never been contemplated before. At least those people living in the vicinity of areas such as Wisley Airfield and Gosden Hill Farm have been aware of the likelihood of such massive change for decades. Uncertainty about the future has been taken on board by people living there for a long time. This is not the case in respect of sites A46 and A29. These would create undesirable uncertainty for the majority of people living there.

Regarding the specific sites A46 and A29 it is my view that the imposition of such a massive amount of new development will have a serious detrimental effect on those areas. The roads in Normandy, Guildford Road/Glaziers Lane/Westwood Lane, are very heavily used not only by private cars but also goods and heavy goods vehicles. The road system is unsuitable for any further increase of traffic. The railway bridge at Wanborough Station is narrow and has an awkward skew. I see little chance of this being improved during the
life of the Plan. The Railway bridge in Westwood Lane is narrow, low and skewed and cannot be used by heavy good vehicles, putting and unreasonable strain on alternative routes such as Glaziers Lane. Again, I see little chance of improvement there in the life of the Plan.

The roads in Ash Street and Ash Wharf are already heavily overcrowded and the imposition of much increased traffic there seems to me to be totally unreasonable and very plain to see.

Regarding the creation of two villages, if the massive development of A46 goes ahead there will inevitably be, one would hope, shops and community facilities included in the proposals. This will, in my view, detract from the on-going success of the current village centre which is developing around the new village hall and the Manor Fruit Farm site. I accept that some form of development in Normandy will be inevitable, but I feel strongly that this should be by way of a limited number of small in-fill sites which would come on in a gradual manner so that new families can be absorbed into the existing character of the village.

In conclusion, to be clear, my personal main objection to the Plan would be the release of Site A46.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Has a new medical practice been considered? Our existing one is very full and appointments difficult to get.

Both Westwood lane and Glaziers Lane are very narrow and traffic is reduced when buses, delivery trucks and cars are packed. The 2 railway bridges are also narrow and reduced to single lanes with heavy traffic.

Heavy traffic and buses have to both carriage ways when entering Glaziers lane at the junction with the A323 when coming from the Guildford direction – causing problems at peak times.

Subsidence and flooding has also been a problem on several occasions at that junction.

I agree with many, many other residents of this village that the infrastructure is not suitable for such a massive development in the Green Belt and encroaches on the Surrey Hills and conservation area there.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Local plan consultation for sites A46 and A47

I am delighted that the above sites for a major development project have been removed from the Local Plans.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2441  Respondent: 10910753 / Heather Thompson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.
With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become even more biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1239  Respondent: 10911201 / Claire Walker  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( No ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

I object to this 'strategic site' proposal as I believe it would completely destroy our community. It will be an increase of 175% in the population of Normandy over the plan period. It will cause untold misery on our already full to capacity roads. This is a green belt site that is red sensitivity. Removing its green belt status and building 1100 homes cannot be justified when these fields are within 3 kilometres of the Thames Basin Heathes special protection area. There need to be exceptional circumstances proven to remove land's green belt status. An up to 8 form entry secondary school is neither needed or 'exceptional circumstances'. The local plan states that 'Secondary educational need will be re-assessed at planning application stage' but if the houses have been built and there is no need found for a secondary school it will already be too late, the green belt will have been removed and the fields tarmacked and concreted over. Where will all the water that pours onto the Hogs back and Ash ranges go then, with no fields to soak it up? Glaziers Lane floods regularly as does Wanborough station without the addition of all that is proposed. There is no need for a secondary school as the two closest schools are undersubscribed and the building of houses cannot be used as a reason for a new school because the school is being used as an enabler for the building of the houses on green belt.

There is an inconsistency in putting Normandy and Flexford together when assessing sustainability yet regarding them as separate when assessing sensitivity. It means that the fields between the two settlements that contribute so much to the openness of the green belt, can be ignored.

The two lanes that border the site are at present brought to a standstill if there is a problem on the A31 or A3. The extra traffic that will be generated by an extra 1,100 homes and a secondary school will impact on every residents (present and future) lives, causing chaos on the roads.
A Showmans site is proposed, and I would like to know how it is envisaged to move the large equipment that will be stored on a Showmans site, when there is a low bridge on Westwood Lane and a small humpbacked bridge on Glaziers Lane, just past where pedestrians walking north have to cross from one side of the lane to the other with no view of oncoming traffic.

This is a developer led proposal that Normandy residents have not had an opportunity to comment on until this late stage because this site did not appear in the 2014 version of the Draft Local Plan, so we were unable to make our needs and views known.

The impact this proposal will have on wildlife is enormous. The Skylarks, Barn owls, Little owls, Cuckoos and other birds will lose their habitat. The Glow worms, Adders, Grass snakes and Slow worms will also. The light pollution from a development of this size will impact on our night skies, and the pets associated with these homes will also have a detrimental effect on the wildlife. All this so close to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. A SANG is a public relations exercise and in no way makes up for what Normandy is losing.

Economic growth may not be the goal of Normandy residents, their goal may be to live in a rural environment within the Green belt.

I object to the proposed A46 Normandy Flexford strategic site.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3859  **Respondent:** 10911201 / Claire Walker  **Agent:**

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wholeheartedly support the removal of the proposals for Site A46 from the Local Plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2507  **Respondent:** 10942433 / Brenda Ottaway  **Agent:**

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the large proposed development at of 2,000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2,000 houses at Gosden Hill and 1,850 houses at Blackwell Farm because it will destroy large areas of Green Belt and agricultural land and produce congestion on the A3 and surrounding roads including Send.

I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing levels. Roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope.

I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeting at the Green Belt strung along the A3 which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 which are all already at 100% capacity.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/5  Respondent: 10949921 / Jan Parker  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- The removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) has left the Plan even further unbalanced against the North East of the Borough with over 40% of the development proposed in this small area of Green Belt
- The potential for a substantial increase in industrial floorspace from 7000 sq m to an unspecified amount at the site A58 Burnt Common does not provide local residents with enough information for a full and proper consultation given the ambiguity and lack of detail within the document

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2673  Respondent: 10952449 / Hugh Robertson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A46 and A47 support of removal from plan. Following my earlier response to sites A46 and A47, the proposed building on Green Belt in Normandy, I strongly support the removal of Sites A46 and A47 from the Local Plan owing to the inability of the infrastructure, particularly transport, health and environmental, to cope with these scales of development. The sites' proximity to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Å protected area also makes the removal particularly welcome in order to protect this key habitat.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

The proposed change to 'inset' of the Normandy and Flexford settlements should be removed and a clear statement that the Green Belt land and surroundings in Normandy and Flexford retains its 'washed over' status as a contributor the openness of the Green Belt. This 'openness' has already been accepted by planning inspectors in past appeals so rejecting 'inset' status would follow this precedent.

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3882  Respondent: 10958337 / David Wright  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
In response to the “Proposed Submission Local Plan” that was recently released I write to object primarily to the proposed development at site A46, but also to raise concerns over the whole plan. My objections to site A46 are outlined below.

Starting with the proposed secondary school:

• Overall, I do not believe that this is a good location for a secondary school. In my view, it is too far centres of population that would use it – to the extent that GBC’s own figures say that only around 30 pupils per year from the local area would “benefit” from having a school in the locality. This would mean that that if the school were to be build and run at full capacity, circa 1000 pupils plus staff would need to “commute in”. Although the school is to be placed near the Wanborough railway station – so that presumably some pupils and staff may travel by train – I anticipate this to be a minority and therefore this means the majority of staff an pupils will arrive by road either in cars or by bus.

• Information about the total and current spare capacity for the surrounding secondary schools has been made available by Surrey County Council, and this shows that some of the local schools are currently running at less than 50% capacity. Together the free capacity in the surrounding schools total 1216 places – more than the total number of place in the proposed Normandy school, and therefore to me this shows that there is no need for an additional secondary school.

• Even if there were demonstrable needs for an additional secondary school to the West of Guildford, my understanding it that there are other sites in the locality – eg Rokers at Fairlands – that have not even been investigated as potential sites.

Focussing on the housing:

• The sheer quantity of the housing proposed (1100 dwellings) will have a devastating impact on the villages of Normandy and Flexford. These are small, relatively quiet, semi-rural villages whose character would be entirely changed by the addition both by increase in the number of residents (circa 175% increase) but also by the density and suggested affordability of the housing stock to be included in the development. To me, this is not either “sustainable” or “sensitive” development, it is better surmised as the insertion of a whole new village.

I trust that this provides useful feedback and look forward to confirmation that the site A46 will be removed from the submitted local plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3353  **Respondent:** 10958337 / David Wright  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• I am pleased to see the removal of this land parcel from the plan and the proposed relocation of the school to Blackwell Farm.

• However, I do not see the need to modify the Green Belt boundaries so that the villages of Normandy and Flexford are inset from the green belt, and hence request that this be removed from the plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2467  **Respondent:** 10963137 / Gabrielle Erhardt  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---
### Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

#### Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object: The removal of site A46 for the Plan has left the plan even further unbalanced - over 40% of the proposed development is planned in the North East of the Borough. This is unfair and will disproportionately impact the Ripley area. The Ripley area has already experienced a great increase in housing and residents through infill and does not need to shoulder the majority of development in the Guildford Borough.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

### Comment ID: PSLPS16/2999  **Respondent:** 10965697 / Maria Angel  **Agent:**

#### Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

#### Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

May I please ask you to consider the points below in terms of the unsuitability of using the above land for a proposed development of 1100 homes, shops, a secondary school within the heart of Normandy village, that will create a village within a village.

On various points I strongly object to the unsustainable development of this Green Belt land on the basis that it directly impinges on the quality of life for all the community that lives within Normandy. I am based at home most of my day and the quality of my family's life will be severely impacted by the development on the basis of the following points.

Normandy as a village and parish holds great historical significance in terms of its ancient copses and the two 16th century houses that directly back on to the development. Normandy has always been appreciated not only as the 'lungs of Guildford' west of the town, but such an unsubstantiated increase in the number of homes by 1100 dwellings is a figure that has not does not directly look at the needs of Normandy Parish residents and cannot be considered sustainable.

The sensitivity test has not been fully examined in terms of the impact this erosion of the Green Belt will have in extinguishing the rural community enjoyed by those that exist within Normandy and Flexford. It cannot be underestimated the destruction of a rural environment placing this development so centrally within Normandy and Flexford. I have personally witnessed wild and domesticated animals killed on the Glaziers Lane road having been caught under the wheels of cars, where the hedgerows adjacent to my property having been removed have disturbed the wildlife.

To place such unsubstantiated and disproportionate development within the open field aspect that I presently enjoy and for Normandy to preserve its rural community environment, will have a destructive and devastating impact on the wildlife and by residents travelling by foot along the Glaziers Lane road, including Normandy's wildlife group, our district bridleways association and the many of us who walk the ancient footpath that exists on that site from Westwood Lane across to Glaziers Lane.

The number of dwellings proposed in the development cannot be proven to be sustainable and is developer led rather than examining the needs of its existing residents. Surrey Community Action undertook a housing needs survey in 2008 and at no point did it highlight the need for quantity of housing proposed that is so disproportionate and unsustainable in the extreme.

The two lanes of Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane that are to service this 1100 home development, 6 pitches, community centre, shopping area, secondary school and playground, cannot sustain this level of traffic and can only compound the traffic congestion that feeds through the single-lane railway bridge and the junctions on to the A323 at Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane. With the emerging development within Ash, to attempt to converge this extra amount of traffic would be practically impossible, where the A323 and Hogs Back arterial routes would remain permanently congested.
In terms of demand for a secondary school, there is no legal evidence in this development case to support the need for one on the basis of Normandy Parish's existing need. Ash Manor and Kings College secondary schools are undersubscribed and there is not the 'exceptional circumstances' to remove the proposed land from the Metropolitan Green Belt. As a youth club organiser for over 8 years, I understand the level of youth demand within the area of Normandy and Flexford and see no substantiated need for a secondary school to be part of this development.

There is severe flooding issues on the natural flood plain that is situated in the field site that sits directly opposite to my home next to the Glasford Stream culvert and bridge. A local water authority officer advised that historically the field on the other side of the road was a water pumping station where the ground held the water as a natural reservoir. This water was pumped out by a neighbouring pumping station situated adjacent to the proposed site. Hence during heavy rainfall or flash floods, the field not only floods to the point of being very difficult and unsafe to walk on, but the water drain in the Glaziers Lane road is unable to manage the quantity of water and overspills in to the road, causing a serious highways road safety problems. This area of consideration is a natural flood plain that then drains in to the Glasford Stream. Photographic evidence is available of the level of flooding in the field and the detrimental impact to safety of road users.

Please consider the points that have been made above and I ask for you to consider also for more homes to be developed on brownfield sites as a first priority where empty office space should be re-developed for homes.

I declare that I am an Independent Member of the Corporate Governance & Standards Committee and have appropriately followed the Monitoring Officer's advice in confirming my position within Guildford Borough Council.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am formally objecting to the local plan to build 1,100 houses and a school in Normandy between Glaziers and Westwood Lane on the following grounds:

- There is no infrastructure in the village - no shop, library, pub and very few buses.
- The roads are narrow and there are two accident black spots on Aldershot Road and Flexford.
- The size of the development is completely out of scale with the surrounding area.
- The planned development is green belt.
- In the interests of equality the plan is breaching the act as it is treating Normandy unfairly by building far more homes than any other area of Guildford borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/644  **Respondent:** 10992417 / Philip Erhardt  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the unbalanced distribution of development. The removal of site A46 from the plan has over-burdened the North-East of the Borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4175  **Respondent:** 11011777 / Sally Norton  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A46.

This land is located with land parcel H12 as identified in GBCS Vol IV. The land is DEFRA agricultural land Grade 3A and has been farmed traditionally for pasture (sheep and cattle) and for grain (wheat and barley) in perpetuity. The land contains many stands of scheduled Ancient Woodland. The land contributes to the ‘openness’ of the Green Belt between the settlements of Flexford and Normandy and should remain ‘washed over’ by the Green Belt.

Legal Precedent

I object to the removal of the land allocated to Policy A46 by removal from the Green Belt by “inset” under NPPF para 83 and 84.

The “exceptional circumstances” required to redraw the Green Belt boundary for the land in Policy A46, appear nowhere in the Local Plan of so how can I judge this proposal?

In the Gallagher Homes Ltd v Solihull Borough Council [2014] EWHC 1283 (Admin), Hickinbottom J decision in particular lays out:
“Exceptional circumstances are required for any revision of the boundary, whether the proposal is to extend or diminish the Green Belt. That is the ratio of Carpets of Worth.

Whilst each case is fact-sensitive and the question of whether circumstances are exceptional for these purposes requires an exercise of planning judgment, what is capable of amounting to exceptional circumstances is a matter of law, and a plan-maker may err in law if he fails to adopt a lawful approach to exceptional circumstances. Once a Green Belt has been established and approved, it requires more than general planning concepts to justify an alteration.”

Without the “exceptional circumstances” included in the proposals for this Policy it appears unsound.

Guildford Borough Settlement Profiles (July 2013) & Settlement Hierarchy (May 2014)

I object to the use of a 2010 survey of parishes that was not represented to parish councils as to be part of the Local Plan evidence base in an attempt to present the two settlements as one in the Settlement Profile document. It is recognised in the Settlement Hierarchy that Flexford and Normandy are separate settlements, neither rank highly based on their individual sets of community facilities and services (Normandy 13, Flexford 27 sustainability ranking in Settlement Hierarchy report).

There is no traditional community centre. The ward contains five hamlets in a dispersed area. It is disingenuous to represent Flexford and Normandy as a combined community.

The incorrect assessment in the Settlement Profile document has been pointed out under Regulation 18 consultation but the council continues to include this flawed document as evidence.

It should be discounted and removed from the evidence base.

Use of educational provision as “exceptional circumstances”

I object to the proposed site of Normandy/Flexford (Policy A46) for a new Secondary School; this should be rejected as the need for such a school in the location has not been proven. GBC in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, May 2016 indicate that SED 3, IDP p87, a 7-form entry (7FE) secondary school at the Normandy / Flexford strategic development site, requires only 1 FE to serve the development site itself, the remaining capacity would serve the wider area, including Blackwell Farm site (Policy A26). However, given that the proposed Blackwell Farm development is for 1,800 dwellings, on a pro-rated basis of children of secondary school age within the arising population, this would only require a maximum of 2FE. Together, the Blackwell Farm site and the Normandy/Flexford site require only an estimated 3 FE provision. The proposed school is excessive in size, being more than twice as large (7FE) as the estimated need (3FE), and as other information provided here indicates, this is well within the funding and expansion capabilities of existing schools in the western wards of Guildford borough and the western side of the town. Every neighbouring secondary school is currently undersubscribed, Kings Manor in particular with 57% of its school places currently unoccupied. SCC Education Officers need to demonstrate a clear need for such a school at this, given the current under-subscription of all the neighbouring secondary schools in the western wards of Guildford borough. There are currently 736 vacancies at the nearest secondary schools serving the western wards - not accounting for the 480 extra at the new Technical College to open in 2018 - a combined capacity of 1,216. In addition to those, SCC has already approved expansions at the County School, Guildford and St Peters.

Adding forms of entry to several existing schools will see the costs absorbed after the initial capital cost needed to create a few extra rooms and they still only require one headteacher, one set of staff etc. The Head Teacher and Chairman of Governors at Ash Manor School have offered to cooperate with a programme to expand that school, as had the Principal at Kings; if it needs expansion in the future there is space and a willingness to do so.

Contribution to the Purposes of the Green Belt

I object to the overriding of the contribution the land proposed for Policy A46 makes to the 5 purposes of the Green Belt in response to a developer-led proposal for large-scale house building in the Green Belt in Policy A46.
Guildford Borough Council recognises the contribution the land surrounding and within the settlements of Normandy and Flexford makes to the five purposes of the Green Belt in identifying land parcels H10, H12, H13, H14, H15, H16, J16 and J17 of particular sensitivity in its reevaluation of the land parcels in the Green Belt & Countryside Study, Vol 2 Addendum, Appendix 1 and 2, reinforcing the evaluation in GBCS Vol 1. The evaluation of the ‘land parcels’ is laid out in the tables in GBCS Vol 4. The ‘land parcel’ that contains the land proposed for Policy A46 is H12, evaluated against 4 purposes of the Green belt it performs as follows:

- Checks sprawl of Normandy and Flexford
- Prevents Flexford and Normandy from merging
- Assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

All of this is then ignored in the rush by GBC to appease Taylor Wimpey in order to affirm another strategic housing site and hold its hands up as if to say “not us Guv, its wos the developer that done it”.

Contribution to ‘openness’ of the Green Belt

I object to the rejection by GBC that the land proposed for Policy A46 fails to contribute to the “openness” of the Green Belt.

In the case of Normandy and Flexford, there have been two planning appeals concerning Gypsy pitches (Palm House Nurseries and Green Lane East) where the inspector agreed that land near Flexford and land to the west of Glaziers Lane exhibited ‘openness’. The inspector found in favour of the appellant on other grounds but the opinion on ‘openness’ in those judgements is evidence that the land around Normandy and Flexford is considered by the Planning Inspectorate to exhibit ‘openness’. A third more recent decision at appeal for housing development at North Wyke Farm found that the land contributed to the ‘openness’ of the Green Belt.

- Palm House Nurseries GBC 09/P/01851, Application 12 November 2009 Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/A/10/2131590 Decision 24 Feb 2011
- Green Lane East GBC 10/P/00507, Application 8 March 2010 Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/A/10/2140630 Decision 14 June 2011
- North Wyke Farm GBC 14/P/00779, Application 17 April 2014 Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/W/15/3002308 Decision date: 14 July 2015

I believe this indicates that PINS inspectors recognise the “openness” of the land around the two settlements of Normandy and Flexford and their contribution to the “openness” of the Green Belt.

Impact on Surrey Hills AONB

I believe both settlements should remain ‘washed over’ by the Green Belt as stated in NPPF para.86 “If it is necessary to prevent development in a village primarily because of the important contribution which the open character of the village makes to the openness of the Green Belt, the village should be included in the Green Belt”.

The land designated as AGLV and identified as 12-1 in the Map AONB Boundary Review - Recommended Areas for Consideration and pp28-29 AONB Area of Search Evaluation - Natural Beauty Evaluation, Oct 2013 report to be added to the Surrey Hills AONB, reinforces the proximity of valued landscape as it will add the north slopes of the Hogs Back overlooking Flexford settlement to the very boundary of Flexford settlement at Flexford Road.

Further, the land allocated in Policy A46 contains unrestricted view of the Hogs Back, part of the Surrey Hills AONB. Recent case law establishes that views out from open land to an AONB are as important as views into land overlooked by an AONB. Surrey Hills Management Board (of which GBC is a member) has submitted proposals to Natural England for land currently with local designation Area of Great Landscape Value on the north slopes of the Hogs Back.
above Wanborough and stretching down to Flexford Road at the southern boundary of Flexford settlement to be subsumed into the AONB and is currently awaiting agreement for inclusion.

The future potential presence of in excess of 1,000 houses visible at the periphery of the AONB with associated urbanising infrastructure (e.g. roads, perpetual street lighting, general light pollution, loss of ancient hedges and trees etc.) would do great harm to the views into the AONB from the land between Normandy and Flexford and from the Surrey Hills AONB. There will be significant light pollution in winter months.

Thames Basin Heaths SPA

I object to the assertion in Policy P5 that the creation of SANG will protect the rare ground-nesting bird species on this SSSI and Natura 2000 site from major disturbance and predation introduced by the building of 1,100 dwellings that give rise to hundreds of adults and children, vehicles, dogs and cats within 1 kilometre of this internationally important wildlife habitat.

The 2012/13 visitor survey report commissioned by Natural England on behalf of the Thames Basin Heaths Joint Strategic Partnership Board showed not a static or falling number but a 10% increase in visitor numbers since 2005:

- 66% cited dog walking as the main activity
- 80% of interviewed groups had dogs
- 67% of interviewed groups had dogs which were seen off lead
- 39% specifically visited the SPA site was because it was ‘close to home’
- the average distance travelled was just over 2.5 kilometres (80% by car)

Only 1% of visitors accessed the TBHSPA from the Normandy/Flexford direction, so the additional disturbance caused by the building and then occupation of 1,100 homes by 2,000-3,000 residents and 1,250 additional vehicles will be significant. Importantly, the prevalence of dog walking in the visitor survey suggests that the currently available SANG in the borough is ineffective in attracting those wishing to exercise dogs away from the TBHSPA.

Simply claiming that the 2012 visitor study data indicates success of the avoidance strategy in drawing people away from the SPA is no evidence at all. Where is data based on measurement of visitor numbers to the available SANG within Guildford borough? Where is the evidence that SAMM programmes have any impact on the behaviour of residents that are dog owners? Without it, a planning inspector has no means of finding the proposal of large-scale housebuilding at these sites sound. Natural England have admitted that no survey evidence exists of the effectiveness of SANG or SAMM programmes in directing dog-walkers away from TBHSPA in Guildford borough or any of the surrounding local authorities.

Creating 1,100 homes on Green Belt land between the settlements of Normandy & Flexford implies, on average, 340 dogs and nearly 290 cats (based on a survey of households carried out by a veterinary team at Bristol University in 2010 “Number and ownership profiles of cats and dogs in the UK” published in the Journal of The British Veterinary Association indicates 31% households own dogs and 26% households own cats); all housing to be located within 1 kilometre of the SSSI;

for a dog owner, a 2-minute drive or 10 minute walk away. The survey showed dogs were more likely to be owned by rural households.

The proposed SANG schedule in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, May 2016 (IDP, SANG 13 p84) gives indication of neither the physical size nor location of bespoke SANG for Policy A46 (LAA Site 368); it is estimated that this proposed open space will be unable to cater adequately for 340 additional dogs plus their accompanying owners and there will be significant ‘leakage’ onto the TBHSPA.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1435</th>
<th>Respondent: 11023713 / Yuanxing Zheng</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I would like to express my strongest objection to the proposed development plan in Normandy Flexoford (A46) area.

Normandy is a small village with only about 1300 houses, an additional 1100 houses will in effect double the village size which will impose enormous stress to an already very fragile infrastructure. The Wanborough railway bridge is in a very poor heath due to the existing heavy lorry traffic. It had to undertake a major emergency repair work only just over 1 year ago. We can not imagine how it can cope with double or triple the traffic if this new development were to go ahead.

The evidence to support an additional secondary school is not convincing at all. According to villagers’ own research, there are plenty spaces in schools around west of Guildford. It seems the sole purpose of this new school is to serve the A46 new development site requirements, which can not be used to justify the development proposal.

We have seen a clear statement from the Government stating that releasing land from Greenbelt for development can only be approved for exceptional circumstance. GBC’s proposal does not have any evidence to demonstrate it. There are many wild life in the village, their habitat areas have been reduced by 32 acres in the past few years. Reduced land further will impose major threats to the deer and many birds in this village.

For the above reasons, I object to the draft plan drawn up by GBC.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3747</th>
<th>Respondent: 11027489 / J Pamplin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Having lived in Normandy since 1957, moving here with my husband and bringing up our two children in the village I am outraged that the beautiful fields between Westwood lane and Glaziers lane are proposed to be built on.

I don't think you have considered the impact on the local area. I live on Westwood lane and know how busy the road is today the thought of 1000+ houses and a school built and more traffic to the village. That is without traffic from the expanding neighbouring villages. It would be impossible for those who live in the village. The road has a narrow railway bridge that could not be widened without the removal of nearby properties. Glaziers lane is much the same. I have enjoyed living in this rural village for nearly 60 years.

Has anyone considered the flood risks to the area and building on all this beautiful Green belt land. I and my family have enjoyed living in the village of Normandy this unjustified development of housing and large school would threaten the wildlife and landscape. This would be detrimaental to my health and wellbeing.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6570</th>
<th>Respondent: 11034337 / Judith Hill</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to say that I OBJECT VERY STRONGLY to POLICY A46. I see no exceptional circumstances for releasing this site from the Green Belt.

I am also concerned that Normandy will become simply a suburb of Guildford and it will lose all identity as a village. There is only a need for a secondary school in this location if a large number of houses are built, so it cannot be justified as a separate entity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1085  Respondent: 11039681 / Bruce Jeffreson  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.

With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become even more biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2149  Respondent: 11043425 / Melinda McLean  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.

With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become even more biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6850  Respondent: 11078817 / Rachel Miller Johnson  Agent:
I object to the proposed development at Normandy and Flexford.

Secondary School

The proposed 7-entry form secondary school as proposed in the plan is not needed. The local secondary schools reveal that the secondary schools nearest to Normandy and Flexford have capacity to include more children as they are undersubscribed. In addition the Guildford County and St Peter Secondary have land available for development, have approved plans for expansion. This would accommodate even more students. The council must recognised that the proposed secondary school is definitely NOT required. Without the requirement for a new secondary school there is no justification to removing the Green Belt status.

Roads and Transport

The local lanes around the proposed development are classified as D roads. These would be unable to cope with the increased traffic of the proposed 1100 new residences representing at least 1100 more vehicles in the area. And the twice daily traffic for the dropping off and collecting children from the proposed secondary school would further compound the traffic congestion.

Even now, it is difficult to both exit Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane onto the Aldershot Road in the mornings, peak hour, and attempt to cross or turn on to Aldershot Road in the morning and evening rush hour. With school drop off and pick up added to the current traffic this area would be a parking field rather than moving traffic.

Other than traffic the council seems to have no interest in maintaining the quality of the roads. There are ever growing potholes in Glaziers Lane, Westwood Lane, Flexford Road. If it rains for just one night half the road can be flooded forcing drivers to swerve around these new water masses.

Glaziers Lane has a narrow railway bridge not suitable for high volume of traffic and not strong enough to endure heavy delivery lorries needed for the multiple constructions in this plan. There has been no mention in the plans for funding to reinforce or replace or even repair this bridge and the roads leading to it. Westwood Lane has a low single lane railway bridge which would not be suitable to large lorries.

Medical services

The current medical surgeries at Glaziers Lane and the Fairlands Surgery are not able to service the current population. Waiting time for appointments has increased and patients are waiting weeks to be seen. The development plan does not address how further services will be supplied to a large population.

Flooding / Sewerage

Flood risks have not been considered and certainly have not been addressed by the Guildford Borough Council. Rain water flows down the Hog’s Back chalk into Flexford / Normandy area causing a high water table. Drainage of the sewers is inadequate in this area. During the wet season residents in Glaziers Lane have raw sewerage flowing in their gardens. If Thames Water has not addressed the sewerage infrastructure capacity for current residents they will not be able to keep up with the demands from a growing population with the proposed development.

A46 Fails or even breaches the National Planning Policy Framework whilst ignoring rights of local residents.

The council has been neglecting their responsibility to rate payers as there has been no consultation by council with local residents. There has been no council early and meaningful engagement with local neighbourhood organisations. This is a developer driven rather proposal based on ease of throwing up buildings en masse for their greater profit and convenience for the council to work with only one supplier.

The council should be addressing the use of brown space rather than destroying Green belt.
This development is a threat to the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area. The green belt is for the benefit of all, not for the one off profits of a small group. The green belt must be preserved – these are ancient woodlands supporting deer, badgers, birds, bees and butterflies. Biodiversity is needed, even in England, to support human life.

Once gone there is no more wilderness.

This development should not be approved as there is no proven need for the proposed secondary school. The council has not provided sufficient justification or special consideration for building on this Green Belt.

I object strongly to the proposed development.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3106</th>
<th>Respondent: 11078817 / Rachel Miller Johnson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GBC needs to acknowledge that for expediency of getting their plans through they are bending the rules.

Removal of site A46 and A47 from the plan.

I support the removal of these sites from futures plans as the infrastructure does not support the current community:

1. a) The roads are poorly maintained. There is a serious lack of maintenance of roads in the local area. The roads are too narrow for the volume of traffic. The narrow angled bridge at Wanborough is barely safe for the current traffic due to the lack of visibility coming to the crest.
2. b) There is frequent flooding and back up of sewerage into gardens. If there is more than a few hours of rain the drainage on these roads is unable to cope. Further roll off from driveways and covered paths from the development will further exacerbate the flooded roads. The flooding makes it difficult to drive safely.
3. c) Health and Medical provision for the area is insufficient. The Fairlands Clinics are unable to provide appointments with short notice.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7139</th>
<th>Respondent: 11183809 / Robinson Escott Planning LLP (Joe Alderman)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please find attached letter in respect of the above relating to Land to the south of Normandy and North of Flexford – Policy A46

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:** [POLICY_A46_20160715133244.pdf](attachment:POLICY_A46_20160715133244.pdf) (1.7 MB)
Omission Site: Policy A46 - Land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford

Our client has a controlling interest in a significant part of the land between Flexford and Normandy. In the previous 2016 version of the Plan, the site formed a proposed allocation for residential led mixed use development under Policy A46. It is now proposed to be deleted in the current consultation version of the draft Local Plan. We object to this proposed omission and wish to see the Policy A46 allocation retained.

Consideration of the Council’s Evidence Base and Proposed Green Belt Releases

The proposed deletion of the site is explained by the Council at paragraphs 4.26 and 4.27 of the report to Full Council dated May 2017 which stated:

“Site allocation A46: Land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford

This site was allocated for 1,100 homes, six Travelling Showpeople plots and a mix of other uses. It is a high sensitivity Green Belt site which was only proposed to be allocated previously on the basis of its ability to provide the secondary school required to meet the development needs arising in the west of the borough. Since the previous consultation, the promoters of Blackwell Farm have now confirmed that they are willing to provide a secondary school on their site. Blackwell Farm is a preferable location in relation to both school place planning and sustainability perspectives, and was only discounted previously on the basis that the site was not available for education provision. Given the site consists of the whole land parcel assessed to be high sensitivity Green Belt, the allocation of this land would result in significant harm to the Green Belt. However great weight was given to allocating a site that could provide an eight form entry secondary school in the west of the borough. Whilst there would continue to be some sustainability benefits associated with the allocation of the site in relation to additional services, given the other harm we do not consider that this is justified without the benefits associated with the provision of the secondary school.”

We object to the Council’s suggestion that our client’s site is a ‘high sensitivity Green Belt site’ and for the reasons set out below note that it actually compares favourably to other proposed Green Belt releases in the Plan. However in any event, we refer to paragraph 24.66 in Volume 5 of the Council’s Green Belt & Countryside Study (April 2014) that states:

‘A PMDA at land parcel H12-A between Flexford and Normandy would be appropriate as a major village expansion due to the established public transport links alongside potential improvements to sustainability credentials, being considered to outweigh the potential harm to the openness and purposes of the Green Belt. A major expansion at H12-A between Flexford and Normandy would generate an additional population of approximately 2,599 and a total population of 4,383, this being very likely to enable a wide range of new facilities with associated sustainability benefits. The location of H12-A between Normandy and Flexford is considered to be particularly sustainable in terms of public transport connections with Wanborough Station located directly to the south within Flexford in addition to the bus services. The PMDA would result in greater settlement coalescence of Flexford and Normandy (Purpose 2). Whilst recognising that any major village expansion will detract from the openness of the surroundings, in this instance, the PMDAs impact will be limited on the wider Green Belt due to extensive woodlands, treebelt and hedgerows, particularly at Waldens Copse and Pusseys Copse within the village expansion site’ (Our emphasis)

It has never been our understanding that our client’s site was included as a proposed Green Belt release due solely to its ability to deliver a secondary school. The reason for its previously proposed allocation is effectively summarised in the above statement.

Land for a secondary school was only proposed as part of our representations upon the proposed safeguarded status of the site in the draft Local Plan published for consultation in July 2014. Accordingly, the offer of land for the school was
made by Taylor Wimpey after the Council’s Green Belt assessment (see above) confirming the suitability of developing
the site in Green Belt terms, including having regard to the sustainability merits of doing so in locational terms (given the
proximity of the site to bus and rail services).

In short the land benefits from sustainability credentials that justify its release, in particular, given its enabling benefit of
providing land for a new secondary school to serve needs arising from the western part of the Borough and that the land’s
impact upon the Green Belt will be limited due to its existing vegetation. There is therefore a fundamental inconsistency
between the Plan’s evidence base and the decision taken by the Council in May 2017. Accordingly, the Local Plan is not
justified when considered against its own evidence base in this respect.

With the above findings in mind, our clients instructed CSA Environmental to undertake a detailed review of the
Council’s Green Belt evidence base documents. This work includes a comparative assessment of certain of the proposed
Green Belt allocations and confirms in relation to the sites as follows:
- The assessment has highlighted some fundamental flaws in the selection of the sites to be removed from the Green Belt
and allocated for housing.
- The sites proposed to be allocated should be re-evaluated and the A46 site reinstated as a housing allocation.
- Land at Garlick’s Arch (Policy A43) fails the Council’s Stage 1 Green Belt test and should be removed on
sustainability grounds.
- Land at Blackwell Farm (Policy A26) is clearly detached from the existing urban edge and represents significant
encroachment into the countryside and the proposed access to the site emphasises its poor relationship to the urban area –
with the proposed access road extending approximately 0.75ha through the Surrey Hills AONB and Area of Great
Landscape Value. This site should be deleted as a proposed allocation.
- The Former Wisley Airfield (Policy A35) is poorly related to any urban areas and its removal from the Green Belt
would represent significant encroachment into the countryside. The linear form of the allocation does not lend itself to a
sustainable form of development. The proposed allocation should be removed from the Green Belt.

Overall, the CSA report identifies fundamental failings within the Council’s approach in respect of the proposed release
of Wisley Airfield and parts of Gosden Hill and Blackwell Farm having regard to their consistency with national policy
not least the Green Belt purposes established at paragraph 80 of the NPPF.
When assessed against the paragraph 80 tests, it is evident that paragraph 24.66 of the Council’s Green Belt &
Countryside Study was correct and the site performs well when assessed the five purposes.

Importantly the Council’s proposed allocations perform in certain cases poorly when considered against the NPPF
paragraph 80 purposes. Accordingly we request that our client’s site is reallocated either in addition to, or instead of other
proposed Green Belt releases. As drafted, the Plan is not justified or consistent with national policy, given that the
reasonable alternative of allocating land at Normandy/Flexford, that provides a more sustainable and NPPF Green Belt
compliant strategy.

On its own merits the actual visual and Green Belt implications of releasing the Policy A46 site for development are not
adverse. Moreover, and on a comparative basis, the impacts from allocating the site are comparable to certain of the other
proposed releases and better than others (including Wisley Airfield).

**Land at Normandy/Flexford (Policy A46) - Site Description**

We set below out the site’s respective benefits as a potential residential led mixed use allocation.
The site lies mid-way between the towns of Guildford and Aldershot in Surrey. It is bound by the settlement of
Normandy to the north and Flexford to the south. The Great Western railway line between Guildford and Reading runs
adjacent to the site’s southern boundary, with Wanborough Station located adjacent to the south east corner of the site. To
the north of the site lies Guildford Road (A323), with Westwood Lane to the west and Glaziers Lane to the east. The site
extends to approximately 69ha and comprises a series of medium to large pastoral and arable fields, several woodland
copses and a number of small farm buildings. The logic of the site’s location is appropriate particularly due to its location
adjacent to a train station that offers direct services between Guildford and Reading.

**Sustainability Considerations**
The site is in a sustainable location, adjacent to Wanborough railway station which provides frequent services to Guildford and Ascot via Aldershot as well as some direct services to Reading and Gatwick. Train services connect to the following main employment centres:
- Guildford
- Woking
- London
- Reading
Journey times to Guildford and Woking are particularly appealing, taking just 7 minutes to Guildford and only 23 minutes to Woking during peak hours (total journey time including 1 change at Guildford).

Two bus routes serve the site and there is potential to divert these through the site to make these services closer for future residents, a matter which can be addressed/funded/secured by means of a legal agreement as part of the subsequent planning application. In short, re-routing buses into the site, providing access to the schools and the local centre, will serve to enhance the sustainability merits of the wider area, including for the existing nearby villages.

The site also benefits from good cycle links to Ash and Guildford, which routes could be further enhanced in the form of a planning obligation to be secured at the planning application stage.

As to highway matters, detailed technical highway work has been undertaken by Odyssey Consult who have identified that the surrounding road network has adequate capacity to accommodate the level of proposed development. Access to serve development of the site is proposed from Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane.

**Masterplan Considerations**

Informed by meetings held with the Council since 2014, our client has undertaken detailed masterplanning and technical work across the entire site so to demonstrate the deliverability and appropriateness of the land for strategic development. Our representations are supported by a number of concept Masterplans as follows:
- Masterplan CSA/2516/110/D – the basis of the policy A46 allocation
- Masterplan CSA/2516/110/F – 1,300 dwellings (omitting the provision of a secondary school)
- Masterplan CSA/2516/120/A – 425 dwellings at Flexford, including a proposed local centre
- Masterplan CSA/2516/121/B – 400 dwellings at Wanborough Stn, including a proposed local centre[1]

Background technical work has been undertaken in order to inform the content of the masterplan, including highway, drainage, landscape and ecology work.

Concept Masterplan (Plan No. CSA/2516/110/D) proposes circa 1,100 dwellings on approximately 28ha of residential development, equivalent to around 37dph which enables the provision of a range of dwellings types in accordance with the findings of the SHMA, including the housing mix at paragraph 4.2.3 of the Local Plan. This Masterplan formed the basis of the policy A46 allocation and shows how the site could deliver strategic benefits for the wider area in terms of supporting infrastructure, consisting of:
- Primary school;
- Secondary school;
- 60 bedroom care home;
- Local centre;
- Playing fields;

[1] Masterplan CSA/2516/122/B shows a comprehensive proposal to include the schemes from Plans 120/A and 121/B
- New children’s play areas; &
- Site for travelling show people.

It is considered that the mix of uses proposed forms a key element in creating a successful and sustainable neighbourhood, which will deliver a range of benefits, as follows:
- A number of community focal points spread throughout the development, with a natural landscape buffer existing between the two villages so to give the development a two village character;
- Convenient access to facilities, providing the critical mass to make the wider area more sustainable (including through increased frequency of public transport services and the provision of local services and facilities);
- Architectural interest created by non-residential buildings, whose status and function will create new local landmarks;
- Opportunity for innovative sustainable building technologies to be used in non-residential buildings;
- Greater opportunity for social interaction due to greater pedestrian activity;
- Substantial areas to be provided for formal and informal recreation; and
- Education opportunities

The Masterplan accounts for the site’s existing environmental features, which include woodland and tree belts (including designated ancient woodland) and a public footpath running between Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane.

The new parkland is envisaged to incorporate multiple functions and uses, including new sports pitches, children’s play areas, new routes for walking and cycling and areas for informal recreation. The existing woodland, trees and hedgerows will form an integral part of the parkland, providing an instant sense of maturity to the new public open space. The areas of ancient woodland will have restricted access to ensure their ecological value is protected and benefit from 15 metre buffers consistent with national guidance. In total the Concept Masterplan accommodates approximately 29ha of green infrastructure.

The local centre, primary school and care home are proposed to be located close to one another in order to encourage residents to make multi-purpose trips to the local centre. A bus route is illustrated to run through the site, enabling all future residents to live within a short walking distance from a bus service. Further the secondary school is purposely sited on the site’s southern side so to facilitate sustainable transport movements via Wanborough station.

Clearly, the above service offer will be further assisted by the additional services that would be constructed as an outcome of the proposed scheme. It is further noted that the provider, Great Western Railway, are presently carrying out upgrades to the train line running through Wanborough, which will result in improved services. Clearly the additional patronage generated by the proposed development will only further support the viability of this service.

As part of this scheme, we can bring the secondary school site forward early on in the development phase to meet current education needs within this part of Guildford Borough. This is of particular importance should there be any delay in delivering a secondary school at Blackwell Farm.

In the alternative, should the Local Plan Inspector be of a mind to support the provision of a secondary school at Blickwater Farm (despite our objections to the allocation of the site), we have prepared a second overarching Masterplan (CSA/2516/110/F) showing how the site could be development for up to 1,300 dwellings without a secondary school.

Additional Masterplans show how smaller land parcels could be developed for circa 400 dwellings (Plans CSA/2516/121/A and 122/A) either in isolation or in combination. This further supports the merits of the land as a flexible allocation to meet the identified need for housing in the early part of the plan period.

**Flood and Drainage Considerations**

Flood and drainage considerations have also been assessed by Odyssey Consult. The site is predominately located outside the floodplain in Flood Zone 1 and is well positioned to deliver residential development in accordance with the NPPF thus satisfying the sequential approach in the SFRA. A proportion of the site in the vicinity of Walden’s Copse is located in Flood Zones 2 and 3. However, the proposed development footprint will be positioned outside the floodplain in accordance with the Sequential Approach and in order to reduce impact to the floodplain and flood risk downstream.

A drainage strategy will be developed in accordance with EA requirements including proposals to enhance the existing watercourses within green corridors, dry swales and attenuation basins to ultimately discharge surface water runoff at existing greenfield rates downstream of the site. For these reasons, matters relating to flood risk and drainage should not impede the development of the site.

**Ecological Considerations**

Our client is aware that the proposed residential scheme requires the delivery of a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace to provide mitigation for potential recreational impacts to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area.
(‘TBH SPA’). Accordingly our clients have agreed an off-site SANG provision 0.5Km to the west of the site at Wyke (see SANG location plan attached). This is linked to the site by way of an existing public footpath and enables the efficient use of the site for residential and associated development, whilst providing new walking areas to the benefit of both new and existing residents.

Initial walkover surveys have been undertaken on both the Wyke SANG and the proposed allocation under policy A46 and show that nature conservation interests within the site are concentrated to the areas of ancient woodland, broadleaved woodland, mature trees, hedgerow and the watercourse that runs through it.

**Deliverability**

For the reasons discussed in our response to Policy S2, there is an demonstrable need for deliverable sites, such as that controlled by our client in order for the Council to be able to demonstrate a continuous 5 year housing land supply throughout the plan period. Its development credentials have been acknowledged in its previously proposed allocation and the site suffers from no technical constraints to delivery. The site is controlled by a national house builder, who has secured appropriate off-site SANG mitigation land at Wyke (SANG location plan attached) and is undertaking detailed survey work to enable a timely outline submission upon adoption of the Plan. Consequently the site offers the opportunity for material delivery within the 5 year period. We consider the site could deliver 100 dwellings by 2021/22, 140 dwellings in 2022/23 and a further 140 dwellings in 2023/24. Such an approach would assist in meeting the defined and pressing needs discussed above. The re-allocation of the site is therefore necessary so to achieve an effective plan that is delivers housing at the necessary time (i.e. early on it in the plan period).

**Alternative Allocation Options**

Our clear position is that the site should be reinstated as an allocation under Policy A46 and the Council’s proposal to de-allocate the site is unsound.

However, and notwithstanding, the site at Normandy/Flexford was identified within several volumes of the Council’s Green Belt & Countryside Study, both as a smaller development parcel in the south (adjacent to Wanborough station) of approximately 280 dwellings and a larger development of approximately 1,100 dwellings.

The current iteration of the Local Plan has removed the site as an allocation without reconsideration of a potential smaller allocation. Accordingly, we have prepared 3 no. new masterplans that illustrate how smaller developments could come forward on the site and still provide a material contribution towards defined housing needs. These are described below:

- Concept Masterplan – Wanborough Station (No. CSA/2516/121B) illustrates a proposed scheme on the southern part of our client’s site. This would provide for approximately 400 no. dwellings, a 2 form entry primary school, local centre and large of areas of publicly accessible green space. A direct pedestrian route to Wanborough station is also provided.
- Concept Masterplan – Great Westwood (No. CSA/2516/120A) provides for approximately 425 no. dwellings on the northern part of our client’s site. A 60 bed care home, local centre, community facility, sports pitches and public open space are also provided.
- Concept Masterplan – Combined (No. CSA/2516/122B) illustrates how both of these schemes could be developed, whilst retaining a significant gap between Normandy and Flexford. It is evident from this plan that a self-sustaining community, with a multitude of key services and facilities and good accessibility to public transport can be provided on the land. Such a scheme would enable substantial housing delivery and as set out in the CSa Green Belt Review in a manner consistent with NPPF paragraph 80.

In light of the above and the finding that the Council have failed to review these alternative reduced options, we request that this exercise is carried out by the Council prior to submitting the plan for examination.

**Securing a Permanent Green Belt Boundary Beyond the Plan Period**

In addition, NPPF paragraph 83 requires that when undertaking a Green Belt Review Council’s should consider the intended permanence of the revised Green Belt boundaries such that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period. Accordingly we refer to paragraph 4.115 of the original draft Local Plan (July 2014) that stated:

‘National planning policy states that when altering boundaries we should have regard to their intended permanence in the long term so that they are capable of enduring beyond the plan period. This includes, where
necessary, identifying safeguarded land in order to meet longer-term development needs. We have identified safeguarded land at Fairlands, Send Marsh, Normandy and Flexford, as set out in Site Allocation 118-120 and 123. This land will also ensure that we have the flexibility to meet our current development needs should any of our strategic sites not come forward as envisaged over the plan period’.

Contrary to the above statement, the plan no longer includes proposals to safeguarded any land to meet longer term development needs. Such an approach is inconsistent with NPPF paragraph 83. The safeguarding of additional land would introduce greater flexibility into the Plan so to ensure that if one of the proposed housing allocations does not deliver, safeguarded land could fill the gap without the need for a new Green Belt review. It follows that such an approach would enable a more effective plan.

Summary: Proposed Change

We object to the proposed deletion of our client’s land between Flexford and Normandy (Policy A46) as a housing led mixed use allocation. For the reasons set out in these representations we request that it is reallocated in the form previously proposed.

Notwithstanding the above position, alternative options are also available and we are seeking an allocation for smaller schemes as set out below:

1. Allocate the site but with reduced site boundaries that cover the southern and northern sites, resulting in an overall allocation for approximately 825 no. dwellings.

2. Allocate the Wanborough Station site for a residential led allocation comprising approximately 400 no. dwellings.

3. Allocate the Great Westwood site for a residential led allocation comprising approximately 425 no. dwellings.

4. Identify our client’s site as safeguarded land removed from the Green Belt to meet longer term needs beyond the plan period.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
- Letter to LPA _ LP Reps _ TW Normandy _ FINAL Signed _ 24 July 2017.pdf (386 KB)
- Housing_Needs_in_Guildford.pdf (759 KB)
- 2516_09_A_Green_Belt_Review.pdf (2.5 MB)
- SANG_Location_Plan.pdf (13.1 MB)
- 2516_121_B_Concept_Masterplan_Wanborough_Station_Site.pdf (861 KB)
- 2516_110_D_Concept_Masterplan_Email.pdf (1.5 MB)
- 2516_120_A_Concept_Masterplan_Great_Westwood_Site.pdf (814 KB)
- 2516_122_B_Concept_Masterplan_Combined_Sites.pdf (1.6 MB)
- 2516_110_F_LandscapeLed_Masterplan_email.pdf (1.6 MB)

Comment ID: pslp172/4180  Respondent: 14177313 / Ian Macpherson  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Page 144 Site allocation A46 Normandy

Not clear why this land has been removed. In principle it would seem highly suitable.

Strong Obj- maintain A46.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/351  Respondent: 14965985 / Shehryar Shafiq  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Re: Local Draft Plan: Normandy and Flexford Development 1,100 houses

Please accept this letter as a strong objection to the proposed Draft Plan by Guildford Borough Council that affects Normandy and Flexford. My objection is based on the following reasons:

1. It is in the Greenbelt and new development are discouraged in the green belt.
2. A 100% increase in the number of homes in the area will destroy our rural environment and drastically transform the village.
3. The draft plan appears to be developer led and doesn’t consider the impact on the local environment.
4. There are a number of protected wild animals currently living on the proposed area including Deer, Foxes, Hedgehogs, Pheasants, Various Birds, Adders, Doormice, Frogs and Toads. The development will destroy their ecosystems.
5. The impact on traffic will cause major delays on Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane. The infrastructure cannot cope with the huge volumes of cars from the extra houses. No highway improvements can be made to help cope.
6. A secondary school appears to have been offered by the developers. There is no demand or requirement for another secondary school in the area. The local secondary schools are currently undersubscribed. In previous local reviews, Surrey County Council disputed the need for another school. The area is subject to flooding so the playing fields of the schools will get flooded on a regular basis. There is a lack of safe transport links to the school for teenagers. Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane don’t have adequate pavements and there are no safe cycling lanes connecting to nearby villages.
7. The development and lights will affect the views from Surrey Hills Area of Natural Beauty.
8. The area is on flood plains and the current draining infrastructure cannot cope with the proposed extra houses. It is close proximity to the Thames Basin which has special protection.
9. Brownfield sites should be built on first. More homes should be built in Guildford town. Empty offices in Guildford should be turned into homes.
10. The recent result of the EU referendum means it’s highly likely that net migration into the country will fall. This will reduce the demand for housing in the area and create an oversupply which could see house prices crash.
11. There are 8 Grade 2 listed buildings in the site area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1850  Respondent: 14965985 / Shehryar Shafiq  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Having read the revised plan for 2017 I note that you have removed site A46 - 1,100 homes and school and also removed Site A47 - 50 homes. Please note that I support the decision to remove these sites for all the same reasons that I objected to the sites when they were in the 2016 Local Plan.

I also note that you would like to remove from the Green Belt the homes in Guildford Road, northern end of Glaziers Lane, Flexford, Walden Cottages and Palm House Nurseries traveller site. I would like to strongly object to this proposal. The green belt should not be changed at all, the local area could not cope with further development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

- Comment on strategic site A46.pdf (5.4 MB)
- Comment on strategic site A46.pdf (5.4 MB)
- Comment on strategic site A46.pdf (5.4 MB)
We fully agree with and support this proposed change to the Local Plan, being the removal of Policy A46 from the Local Plan. Keith Liddell, S. Jane Liddell and Natasha Liddell. Residents of

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.

With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become even more biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.

With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become even more biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.

With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become even more biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
45 POLICY A46 LAND TO THE SOUTH OF NORMANDY

45.1 I object to policy A46 land to the south of Normandy

45.2 There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints

45.3 There is unproven demand for secondary school places in the west wards that is being proposed as "exceptional circumstances" to redraw the Green Belt boundary. There is strong research evidence from SCC Education which proves existing under-utilisation in long term of secondary places in the west of the borough.

45.4 There is an incorrect calculation of bespoke SANG since only 10 ha are proposed within site but the new population requires 21 ha. This will impact viability if contained in site (65 ha approx) - there is not an additional 10 ha in currently proposed SANG pre-allocated schedule in infrastructure report (Russell Place Farm)

45.5 There is an incorrect evaluation of contribution of land within and between settlements to Green Belt "openness" - the previous PINS decisions in three appeals asserts "openness". GBC state there is no "openness" yet all land parcels in the site are 'red' sensitivity in GBCS Vol 2 Addendum 1 & 2 and all contribute to the 3 key purposes of the Green Belt.

45.6 There is a failure to engage with Rushmoor under the duty to co-operate rules in regards of traffic impact from Aldershot Urban Extension (3,800 homes) The increased commuting to Guildford plus new local vehicles (1,375 estimated) will take the A323 to over design capacity and produce perpetual congestion

45.7 The one railway bridge in Glaziers Lane + 1 railway tunnel in Westwood Lane on North Downs line are restricted (tunnel single lane) with poor geometry and have poor safety records with one fatality in last 15 years and there is no plan in the infrastructure report to widen bridge or replace tunnel (Network Rail). This will lock traffic from new development within site to the north of Flexford. C and D class roads are not designed for volumes indicated in Scenario 5.

45.8 The flood risk will be significantly increased when land is developed. The site lies on the Hogs Back spring line and the land is natural SuDS. There is a stream running through the site with flood risk 3a. Civil engineering mitigation is unlikely to be effective.

45.9 The site will introduce 300+ dogs and 250+ cats within 1km of TBHSPA and SANG will not stop increased disturbance and predation on the SPA.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: | pslp172/2304 | Respondent: | 15114721 / Leslie Macnair | Agent: |
|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|
| Document:   | Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? | ( ) |
| is Sound? | ( ) |
| is Legally Compliant? | ( ) |

I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.

With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become even more biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.
I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.

With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become even more biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11,350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4,613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attended documents:

---

I object most strongly to the planning of 1100 houses in Normandy between Westwood Lane and Flexford - you are creating a town within a village on Green Belt land with no thought to the situation of:

1 Traffic on the Guildford Road and up to the Hogs Back via a one way access to the railway bridge in Westwood lane

2 Doubling the population of the village.

3 We already have a very large Village Hall - so why yet another one.

4 Gypsy facilities - we already have more than our quota in Normandy- this should not go ahead.

5 A secondary school - other secondary schools in the area are under subscribed so not required.

Most important GREEN BELT was created to maintain the countryside - why negate it?

Is it a sop to get planning permission?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Thank you for your time in reading this email in respect of the GBC draft local plan including the Normandy development proposals which include Site Allocation A46.

We attended the local meeting last Wednesday night in Normandy Village Hall to discuss the plan, which was very informative and helpful. Having considered the plan for Site Allocation A46, and the points discussed at the meeting, we have strong objections to the plan for Site Allocation A46, and as a starting point would make the observation that it just seems an extraordinarily complex and problematic plan to implement given all the environmental, transportation and other logistical issues that will need to be addressed to significantly increase the volume of people and traffic in Normandy.

We appreciate that houses are required and need to be built somewhere, but they need to be built somewhere appropriate, and from our perspective there are four obvious and fundamental issues concerning Normandy that need to be dealt with as a starting point, namely:

- that surrounding schools are significantly under-subscribed so why is a new school required;
- how are the already inadequate and busy roads going to cater for the increased volume of cars;
- how is the impact on the protected and fragile local eco-systems going to be satisfactorily managed; and
- how are the flooding issues that affect Normandy going to be sorted out.

Everyone will have their own personal issues and opinions in respect of all of the above and more, but we will just deal with the two issues that from our perspective just make the plans a non-starter regardless of anything else. This is not to say that we do not agree with and support other objections, but traffic and flooding are what we see on a daily basis.

Traffic

I work in Guildford and aim to leave at 7.30am every day and the absolute cut-off time for leaving is 7.45am. If I leave after that point then I will struggle to be at work for 8.30am. We are talking about a distance of 5 miles! The junction where I get on to the A323 is from Hunts Hill Road with Glaziers Lane directly opposite. By 7.45am there is a never ending stream of traffic going past that makes even turning left difficult. You have to take your chances and get out when you can, but at the same time you have the poor people trying to turn right from Glaziers Lane directly opposite, they just get stuck there, and sometimes you both pull out at the same time. It is dangerous and there is too much traffic already at this one junction.

My wife goes down to Petersfield so ideally she would cross the A323 from Hunts Hill Road to Glaziers Lane. She goes a bit later at about 8.15am and has given up trying to make that crossing, it is very dangerous, you wait for ages and when there is a gap in the traffic it is very unclear who has priority. She therefore goes in the opposite direction down Hunts Hill Road to Pirbright Road where she turns left and left again so that she can come to the end of School Lane and turn left and then right, all of which isn't very satisfactory.

Another question is how are the children at the big new school going to get to and from it? Given the traffic and lack of pavements they will not be able to cycle so presumably the majority will need to be driven increasing further the volume of traffic at the prime commuter times.

So, in a nutshell, there is already too much traffic. There have been big developments already around Ash that have flooded the roads with traffic with more proposed, and whilst the bullet point summary in the A46 schedule to the plan acknowledges the issue there are no proposals as to how this could be achieved, and we simply don't see what could be
put in place from an infrastructure perspective to address the significant additional traffic volume that would result from
the proposed developments in Normandy. It was mentioned in the meeting on Wednesday that the developer has set
aside £3m to deal with the upgrading of the road infrastructure. Obviously this wouldn't go very far and simply
highlights how little consideration has been given to this issue.

Flooding

The overnight rain on Wednesday night caused flooding all over Normandy, there was static water and large puddles on
every road, it is dangerous and a real issue. This is the case every time there is a significant amount of rain, be it during
the Summer or the Winter. It is difficult to see how the development could not affect the stream running through the
designated area, so where will this water go? In my experience unless works are specifically being done to address
flooding issues, big developments just exacerbate the problem because there is less land for the water to drain into and it
deprives the locality of the natural water courses so the water will need to find a new course. Flooding is a known and
very noticeable issue in Normandy and again it is difficult to see how the proposed development would not make the
situation even worse, not only for the areas immediately surrounding the development but further afield too where we live
and the main roads that are already prone to flooding. Whilst mention is made of the existing flooding issues in the
bullet point summary in the A46 schedule to the plan, again there are no details of how this problem will be, or could be,
addressed.

Moving away from the specific planning considerations we moved into Normandy itself fairly recently, but have lived in
the general area most of our lives and it seems extraordinary that Normandy should be singled out as the obvious place
for a development of this sort. It is one of the few villages that still has a genuine village feel with a community of
residents who have lived there all their lives. Very different from other local areas such as Worpleston where we have
recently moved from which is mostly inhabited by people who have recently moved out of London down to Surrey, keep
themselves to themselves, and generally just view the village as a useful commuter base for London. This is why we
moved here!

The saddest conversation we heard was at the Normandy May Fair. Two retired ladies who had lived in Normandy all
their lives were discussing the proposals and were clearly just shocked and saddened by the whole proposal. If the
development goes ahead it will deeply affect their whole way of life, as it will for hundreds of other people, and they just
felt frustrated and utterly powerless. The Normandy May Fair includes May pole dancing, stalls selling bric-a-brac and a
dog show that every dog in the village seemed to be involved in. It is difficult to see how such a quaint and relaxed
village gathering, along with the many other social community events throughout the year, would survive in the same
form following the imposition of up to 3,000 new people. It is our view that it would be completely inexcusable to
impose over 1,000 new homes on a rural village in the greenbelt.

Obviously nobody wants a development in their back yard, and it is understandable that any people potentially affected
by a development will react swiftly and with a huge element of self-interest. However we believe that Normandy is
unique in being a genuine village community, and a close community that has been together for many generations. The
reaction of a lot of the long term residents we have heard talk about it is one of bewilderment and sadness rather than
anger and blatant self-interest, because they know what could be destroyed in terms of community and village spirit in
addition to the worrying impact on the countryside and wildlife in the local and surrounding areas.

We understand that the decision rests in your hands so we would also ask that in addition to the more technical and legal
arguments that will be thrown your way that you also just pause to consider the unique spirit of Normandy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Policy A46 should be extended to incorporate land to the west of Westwood Lane between the railway line to the south and the A323 Guildford Road to the north. Please see Plan attached.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: Location Plan _ Westwood Lane _ 2016_07_15 (3).pdf (337 KB)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/413  Respondent: 15173313 / Mary Adkins  Agent:  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This section of the document is not sound because it fails to address serious concerns about pressure on road infrastructure. Traffic congestion in the immediate vicinity (Westwood Lane, A31, Puttenham Heath Rd, Aldershot Rd etc.) has been increasing month by month. If each proposed household within this section were to own just one car, the impact of 1,000+ cars on local roads would be entirely unsustainable, whether they were used for the daily commute to work, for ferrying children, for shopping or for pleasure. The congestion referred to above occurs at all times and is not restricted to the normal rush hours. Non-residents coming into the area (visitors, teachers and parents of children at the proposed school etc.) will place further pressure on local infrastructure.

The area referred to in this section of the document is prone to flooding and has been under water within the past 24 months. It is difficult to see how this propensity to flooding can be resolved in a way that will prevent risk of flooding either to the proposed houses or those in the surrounding area.

The development proposed in this section of the draft plan would alter significantly the nature of the immediate surrounding area, providing a densely populated settlement outside the boundaries of Guildford town in what is still largely a rural area. Combined with plans for other sections of this document (A47: land to the east of the Paddocks plus new traveller and show people's sites in Normandy) and planning applications already under consideration e.g. proposals for some 80 houses at Wyke, this major development proposal would change entirely the nature of this area rich in wildlife, natural woodland and vegetation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/451  Respondent: 15188641 / Janet Banfield  Agent:  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

It is with dismay that I read that Normandy is included in the draft plan for the building of 1100 houses and a secondary school.

Normandy is a small village, of some 1300 houses. This proposal will double the size of a delightful village, bringing with it horrendous traffic problems. Both Glaziers Lane (D60) and Westwood Lane (C16) are narrow, minor roads: one has a one-lane chicane under a railway bridge, the other a blind bend crossing over the railway: dangerous layouts already, but deadly with at least double the increased number of vehicle movements.

I OBJECT TO THIS PROPOSAL ON THE GROUNDS OF INADEQUATE ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE TO ACCOMMODATE VASTLY INCREASED TRAFFIC MOVEMENTS
A school designed to accommodate 1500 students can only increase vehicle movements. The argument that students would travel by train is unrealistic. Most students are transported by parents, by car, to all schools for reasons of cost, convenience and time. The logical place to build a school must be on the Blackwell Farm development, with its 1800 houses already planned by the university and I believe, approved. I gather that local schools, Ash Manor and Kings College are not fully subscribed, so it would seem that plans for a new school are a bait to the council by the developer, in exchange for allowing them to build 1100 houses.

I OBJECT TO THIS DEVELOPMENT IN NORMANDY BECAUSE NO CASE HAS BEEN PUT FORWARD TO JUSTIFY THE NEED FOR MORE SCHOOL PLACES, BUT APPEARS TO BE DEVELOPER LED. ESSENTIALLY, THE COUNCIL IS BEING BRIBED TO ALLOW HOUSE BUILDING WITH THE OFFER OF A NEW SCHOOL.

This village has already given up 32 acres of land, Manor Fruit Farm, to the detrimental impact on wildlife. Reduced numbers of gold-crests, linnets, owls and the destruction of the nightingale population are the result. 1100 houses and a school will destroy what wildlife remains: the foxes, the deer, the hedgehogs, the Badgers.

I OBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS BECAUSE THIS VILLAGE HAS ALREADY LOST VALUABLE HABITATS FOR WILDLIFE AND BUILDING ON THIS SCALE WILL DESTROY, TOTALLY OBLITERATE, NATIVE SPECIES.

No mention has been made of any initiatives planned to deal with flooding which is already an issue within the village. The scale of the development will exacerbate an already intolerable situation.

GBC cannot, or will not provide information regarding the calculation for proposed population growth for Guildford. Surrey University has skewed housing needs within the borough by not building sufficient 'on campus' student accommodation, resulting in several thousand houses being unavailable for the housing market. The university has a moral responsibility to provide accommodation for its students.

GBC has inexplicably REMOVED some development sites included in former draft plans and omitted to INCLUDE other sites OFFERED for development. (Land in Clandon, offered, I believe, by Lord Onslow is not included).

I OBJECT TO THE DRAFT PLAN DRAWN UP BY GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:
- The plan for Normandy development is disproportionate.
- Destruction of the rural environment is unacceptable.
- Poor road infrastructure cannot accommodate massively increased vehicle movements.
- Land adjacent to A46 already has major flooding issues.
- Normandy is indeed a sensitive site, and should be protected, for the benefit of all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
However, if he said I want to build 1100 houses in the middle of a village of 1300 houses, in the green belt on a site which had not previously been considered then it probably would have been a non-starter. So let us see this proposal for what it is, a bribe.

That is bad enough but the developer is offering you something that is not required since the two secondary schools closest to Normandy, namely Kings College and Ash Manor are currently undersubscribed. A point that was very well made by Surrey Councillor Keith Witham.

Now if we look at the site we find it is bounded by a C road (Westwood Lane) and a D road (Glaziers Lane). Not only that but the C road has a dangerous single lane and bend under a railway bridge which has already seen one fatality to my knowledge. The D road also interacts with the railway via a humpback bridge on a bend.

But that is only part of the problem. Both Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane meet the Aldershot Road via dangerous junctions and there has also been one fatality at the Glaziers Lane junction in recent memory.

The other spurious argument is that Wanborough Station will somehow be used by the children to get to the school. Not a chance. They will arrive by car, if for no other reason than cost or convenience.

I could talk about flood/sewage concerns and environmental considerations but there will be many others who are far better qualified to talk about these topics. Suffice it to say, even this Philistine ex-oil man noticed the impact on wild-life that the development of the 20 acre site to accommodate the Therapy garden, Village Hall, Bowls Club, Archery Club and Doctors’ Surgery has had. What chance the remaining wild life with another 1100 house and a large school.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/555  Respondent: 15206433 / Robert Watson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the above development.

Here follows some of the more important reasons.

1) The land is good quality, productive green belt.

2) The existing road network will not support the amount of traffic generated by the school and housing. Currently HGV’s turning into Glaziers Lane from the Aldershot Road have to use part of the opposite lane to get round.

Both bridges over and under the railway are at a dangerous angle to the existing road layout.

It seems to be a lack of judgement to suggest that many people will use the railway via Wanborough Station, they will not, and will use a car particularly when taking children to and from school (if the school is needed, there seems to be some doubt over this).

3) There are existing problems with both rain water and sewage removal, and further development will add to the unacceptable situation.

4) The current power supply is prone to outage.
Before any decisions are made there must be a comprehensive plan to improve the existing road layout, and services, which must be paid for by the developer. He cannot be allowed to develop just because the area is flat without too many problems.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/651  Respondent: 15220257 / T Hampton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

GBC Draft Borough Plan re Normandy - Site Allocation 46 and Site 47

We are writing to object to the proposals to develop Normandy and Flexford as a strategic site, under the draft local plan. We object to this large scale proposal as long term residents of the area, for the following reasons:-

**The scale of the development is out of keeping with the character of the village and destroying greenbelt land**

Normandy is a semi rural village, open with a linear arrangement along the A323, and along Glaziers Lane and Westward Lane, Flexford is an adjoined small residential area. The proposed development with the large number of houses and secondary school is totally out of keeping with the current size of the village, and will infill an open field, on greenbelt land, giving the village the feel of a large estate, dramatically changing the character and openness of the area.

**Infrastructure and services**

As a resident of Guildford Road we already witness the effect of traffic on the area, particularly during rush hour when the road is busy and already at capacity. Road works and traffic accidents on main routes mean that cars from the A31 and A3 use village roads, including Glaziers Lane and Westward Lane as a cut through. Adding over a thousand houses and a secondary school to the area, with already congested slow, narrow local roads and difficult junctions to the main roads, would result in traffic chaos. The proposals are unrealistic and unsustainable and will lead to gridlocked roads, road safety issues and the potential for a detrimental effect on the well being of residents due to increase in pollution. Traffic simulations have demonstrated that the roads are already operating above the designed capacity, with no viable solutions proposed to mitigate or address this issue.

The doctor’s surgery in Glaziers Lane is already struggling to cope with the needs of current patients, and influx of over 2000 people from the new development would put the service under unacceptable strain leading to even longer waiting times. This issue needs to be addressed not ignored in the planning process.

Drainage in the area is poor and has led to flooding issues in the past. The high water table exacerbates the problem, as will adding a large area of developed land in the middle of the village. Whilst some work has been done in the area to address flooding issues this would need to be considered in the context of the proposed development.

**The Proposed secondary school.**

The data for building a large secondary school in the area must be questioned, particularly as there are two secondary schools Ash Manor and Kings College which are both currently undersubscribed. Funding should be used to develop and support these two schools, both of which have struggled over the years to attract pupils. Surely the council should be working with these schools as a matter of priority to improve their facilities, capacity and results before moving onto building another school. I understand that other schools are increasing their capacity to take more pupils, so I would again question the need for another large secondary school.
The station in Wanborough has been put forward as a means of getting students to and from the proposed new secondary school for students living on the Blackwell Farm development. Whilst on paper this would seem a viable option, I consider that the cost of fares would prove prohibitive for many parents to use this method as would other forms of public transport, and should be examined further. Also should we be creating the need for pupils to commute to school rather than consider more local options?

**Detrimental effect on wildlife**

As a member of Surrey Wildlife Trust I am extremely concerned regarding the irreversible loss of greenbelt land and valuable habitat such as ancient woodland, hedgerows and Grassland for indigenous species. The continued fragmentation of natural habitats has already caused a dramatic decline in bird and wildlife populations and we should be looking to preserve not destroy these areas maintaining Normandy’s unique rural character.

We close by reiterating our objection to the density and scale of the development, doubling the size of the village, destroying the openness and character of the area, and above all building on greenbelt land that should be protected for future generations.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1321  **Respondent:** 15231137 / Martin Rossetti  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Re: Proposals for development in Normandy's Green Belt between Glaziers Lane & Westwood Lane, Guildford Borough Council (GBC) Draft Local Plan Site A46

We, as residents of Normandy, are writing to express our concerns and objections to the above proposals that are included in the draft structure plan for our village - proposals that include 1100 new houses, secondary school for 1500 pupils, primary school for 420 pupils, retail shops, showmens pitches and yards, 60 bed residential or care home etc etc.

We object to the above proposals for the reasons below -

This area is green belt land, land for our enjoyment, open space, countryside, land full of wildlife, deer, hedgehogs, birds, foxes, badgers etc etc. Natural habitats and wildlife need to be protected, our area is a priority habitat under The Wildlife and Countryside act 1981 and the NERC act. We object to the erosion of our green belt land; green belt policy is about preventing urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) writes about openness and permanency, openness and permanency in our Surrey Hills Area an area of outstanding natural beauty ... we have a Surrey Hills sign less than half a mile from our house. The above proposals would destroy our green belt.

The proposals are disproportionate and would be an unsuitable development, a 100% increase in the number of homes in our village, the joining of Flexford and Normandy infilled with housing destroying the rural environment and taking away the free space between our hamlets. This area referred to as Site A46 is arable grade 3 pasture land, erosion of this free space will have devastating effects on our wildlife - where will they have to live? The proposed development will increase the urbanisation and joining of Guildford, Normandy, Flexford and Ash/Tongham areas.

Surrey County Council (SCC), we understand, recommended a development at Blackwell Farm site A26 for a number of reasons but in particular for reasons of accessibility in transport terms. Why has this been ignored in favour of this proposal A46? The site A46 proposals would cause complete and unworkable traffic chaos - our roads are gridlocked
during rush hour times as it is, Guildford Road/Aldershot Road and the Hogs Back A31. We have a narrow humpback bridge with weight restrictions in Glaziers Lane over the railway and a single track bridge with the railway going over the top in Westwood Lane. The junction at the beginning of Glaziers Lane at the crossroads with the Guildford Road/Aldershot Road has been turned down for improvement due to lack of space, ditto the Westwood Lane junction at the Wyke Church of St Marks. These are both narrow country lanes totally unable to cope with the necessary construction traffic let alone the traffic generated by 1100 additional homes and the 2 proposed schools! In many places there is insufficient room to widen either of our country lanes, Glaziers Lane/Westwood Lane, there are Grade 2 listed buildings, 'Little Glaziers' for example which is close to the edge of the lane and would be severely impacted by any road widening proposals.

GBC objected to development on MOD land in Aldershot on grounds of insufficient capacity of our roads network, how can they therefore propose development here on the same limited road network?

The railway bridge in Westwood Lane would not permit double decker buses to pass under it and we question if it would be safe for the volume of school children on foot to pass under it with the current level of traffic let alone the increased volume due to the expansion of our villages/hamlets after the completion of the proposed development.

Wanborough railway station would only be a marginal advantage, the 2 stations either side of it are Ash Station and Guildford Main Station, any school children would be far better served to attend the current primary and secondary schools in the main Guildford area or Ash Manor Secondary School and its surrounding primary schools.

Both Ash Manor School and Kings College are undersubscribed on pupil numbers, Kings College currently undersubscribed by 57%, 511 free places, Ash Manor currently undersubscribed by 110 places so there is no need for a further secondary school in this area. There is the new Guildford University Technical College due to open in 2018 which will take 240 pupils from the age of 14 in its first year and will double to 480 places. Christ's College is currently taking 30 more pupils than its official quota as it has the spare capacity to absorb them. Connaught School is undersubscribed by 90 places, and the brand new Hoe Valley Free School that has only just opened last September is undersubscribed. Currently there are a total of 736 vacancies at the nearest secondary schools in the western parishes of Guildford plus the 480 technical college places, a total of 1216 free places at this time or in the very near future!

In addition, SCC have approved plans for the expansion of both the Guildford County School on the west side of Guildford and St Peters School in Merrow. Also the birth rate in this area has fallen, not increased in the last 2 years, and the recent EU referendum result will likely enable this country to place sustainable limits on future population increase due to migration from EU counties. There is no proven need for a secondary school in this area therefore no justification for housing in our Green Belt Land!

Services, electricity, gas, water, sewage etc. are all at capacity we have been informed, the top of Glaziers lane water pipe has continued to break presumably due to the increased pressure being put through the pipe at peak times to meet the increasing demand for this essential service to our existing housing. This couldn't cope with any further demands. The area between Glaziers And Westwood Lanes has a high water table and is prone to flooding, covering this area with concrete and tarmac will only make this problem worse and even if a need for a secondary school were proven, and we suggest it is not, it would need sports playing field facilities which would not be possible on this often water logged land. This land is the natural water course off the Hogs Back hill, an area as previously stated, of outstanding natural beauty in the Surrey Hills. The area has ancient and natural woodlands within it, these may be earmarked to be preserved within the proposals but how can they be enjoyed surrounded by concrete, bricks and tarmac. The wildlife won't be fooled into staying in an urbanised area just because we keep the woods and not the surrounding fields that we currently enjoy, the open space we moved here to live within.

To meet their quota for new housing GBC appear to be concentrating development to a small number of larger development sites. It would be much fairer and acceptable to all concerned to allocate, and share equally, development to
all parishes within the borough rather than destroy large areas of our countryside. Using controlled, small scale, infilling within all of the parishes would preserve our beautiful countryside and the larger open spaces. This may mean that GBC need to look at increasing staffing levels in planning and building control departments, we accept this, but this could be a short term increase for 10 - 15 years whilst the larger number of smaller developments are being built, rather than the permanent destruction of our countryside and green belt. The needs and wishes of SCC and GBC residents need to be considered over and above GBC work load. A smaller number of large scale development sites makes work for GBC staff easier we accept but this is not an argument or reason to permit the permanent destruction and loss of our environment. Multiple smaller scale developments shared across all of the borough would be fair and just to all residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/756  Respondent: 15237217 / Teresa Tilson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( Yes )

I am concerned that there seems to be no mention of improvements to Glaziers Lane, Westwood Road or Normandy Crossroads.

There must be a supermarket. Wanborough station must be improved with ample car parking. Will the current doctors surgery cope with so many new patients?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/758  Respondent: 15237473 / Andrew Parker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

This is a substantial development on green belt land. I see no evidence for the need to to make such a large development on green belt land and 'exceptional circumstances' have not been demonstrated to justify 1,100 houses to be built on the green belt. There is no need for a new secondary school as nearby schools are not currently full and there is no need for a school to serve local residents. It seems the council needs to build this many houses to justify the school rather than the school be required to serve the existing local community.

Has a local census been undertaken to demonstrate the need for a new secondary school? I see no empirical evidence for the need for a school to serve the existing local community in the plan.

This development will increase traffic and there is no evidence in this plan how to manage this extra traffic.

No assessment has been made at peak travelling hours when queues of traffic already appear at key junctions such as the junction of the A323 Guildford Road, Glaziers lane and Hunts Hill Rd and the junction of Westwood Lane and the A323 Guildford Road.

Doubling the size of the village will increase the traffic at these key junctions and before any plan is approved this issue needs to be addressed. Current roads are not designed to handle this extra traffic and Glaziers lane especially is not wide
enough to cope with this extra traffic. I would like to see the traffic analysis which supports this huge increase in houses and subsequent traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/807  Respondent: 15241153 / Patricia Short  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This proposed development of area covered by A46 (Normandy and Flexford) is totally wrong for a "Greenbelt" designated site(s).

Suddenly, this so-called protected area can be released to suit-- I would suggest that few, if any, planning committee members live here or in the region, if they even know where it is, or they would be totally aware of the problems that already exist in this village, like basic infrastructure, and the already increase in the volume of traffic "rat run" and all that entails. Many suffer with unreliable drainage, and the 2 bridges in Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane have their own problems. We certainly do not need another school in this area, and I know the reasons why not, have been covered by those with far more knowledge of this than myself.

Over the 50+ years that we have lived here, there has been much infilling between properties, which has happened gradually, and any extra strain on local amenities has been slowly absorbed, but to put in developments en masse such as suggested by A46 is pure madness, and will totally swamp the surrounding facilities, such as they are. We are already faced with a "pincer movement" from the travelling community, which has its own intricacies, please don't add to an already overloaded village, and destroy what was once described many years ago as" an unfortunate example of ribbon development"-- we like it that way, and the "lungs" of the village give us space to introduce our families and friends to wildlife and recreation.

We therefore strongly object to Planning proposal A46

John and Patricia Short

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/927  Respondent: 15241281 / Susan Burchett  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Strategic Site A46 – Normandy/Flexford
I wish to record my strong objections to the above site which has been included in Guildford Borough Council’s draft local plan.

The plan to build 1,100 homes, a secondary school, a nursing home and traveller pitches on Green Belt land is obviously developer led and no constructive thought has been given to the following:

- **Road Safety**

  Glaziers Lane is an unclassified road and Westwood Lane is classified as a C-class road. The amount of traffic which already uses these roads is immense. They are often used as ‘rat runs’ by vehicles taking a short cut between the A31, A323 and the A3. Because the Lanes are narrow, cars park on the footpaths leaving no room for parents with pushchairs or carers with wheelchairs to get past them so they have to step out onto the roads in order to get past. There is no continuous footpath along Glaziers Lane and people have to cross the road at various points in order to walk on the footpath. Street lighting is also poor in Glaziers Lane. If owners of cars from the proposed housing estate are commuters there are insufficient parking spaces at Wanborough Station and this will lead to more cars trying to park in Glaziers Lane. Also, Wanborough Station car park floods when there is heavy rainfall. There is a humpback bridge over the railway line in Glaziers Lane and despite the electronic 30 mph speed signs cars often exceed the speed limit which is extremely dangerous at this point because of poor sight lines over the humpback bridge. There is also a single-way road under a railway bridge in Westwood Lane with a height restriction so double-decker buses are not able to use this route.

  A nursery school is run at the Emmanuel Church in Glaziers Lane. Traffic is especially busy here when parents drop off and collect their children. A proposed entrance in Glaziers Lane to the new estate would be close to the church and, in my view, could pose safety problems for the small children and their guardians. Staff who work at the nursery school have to park in Glaziers Lane as the area at the front of the church is used as a play area for the children.

- **Services**

  Glaziers Lane is prone to flooding when there is heavy rainfall and there have been problems with the sewers backing up. Our garden has been flooded with sewage in the past. Normandy also suffers from frequent power cuts so there would be extra pressure on the already stretched water and electricity services.

  Extra pressure would also be put on the medical services in the village. It is difficult already to obtain an appointment at the local doctors’ surgery. The practice cannot be expected to appoint more doctors because of the influx of more people from the proposed 1,100 homes in the village. Where would these people receive medical care? This could lead to more pressure on the Royal Surrey Hospital to cover people’s immediate medical needs.

- **School**

  There is no need for a secondary school in Normandy as there are places available for children at Ash Manor School and Kings College and the new Hoe Valley School. If houses are built first in Normandy these children would have to attend other local schools but if the school is built first there would not be enough children to warrant a large secondary school being built. The building of the Hoe Valley School is in its first stages and already traffic jams are building up on the Egley Road because of services being installed and the site traffic. Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane would not be able to cope with all the extra site vehicles and traffic which would be using the Lanes for the proposed housing estate and school.

  I am extremely concerned that, since the referendum Taylor Wimpey’s share prices have fallen dramatically and should permission be granted for this developer to build the 1,100 houses, the school, the nursing home and all the other services they say they will provide, they will renege on providing the land for the school because of lack of funds. Without the school there would be no need for such a large housing estate and I feel Guildford Borough Council should take their responsibility to the people of Normandy very seriously and remove this developer led project from the local plan.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1789  Respondent: 15241281 / Susan Burchett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing in support of Guildford Borough Council’s decision to remove site A46 (the proposal to build 1,100 homes and a school on land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford) and the removal of site A47 (the proposal to build 50 homes on land to the east of the Paddocks, Flexford.) The infrastructure would have been unable to cope with developments of this size, namely the roads, wastewater, sewage, flooding, electricity supply and also the health care.

I also object to the removal from the Green Belt of homes in Guildford Road, northern end of Glaziers Lane, Flexford, Walden Cottages and Palm House Nurseries traveller site. This could enable future development within these areas at a much higher density and could give greater success for future planning applications. In my opinion this is a wrong decision as these areas contribute to the ‘openness of the Green Belt.’

Thank you for listening to the views and concerns of the residents who wrote to you previously regarding the implications of the proposed building in Normandy as set out in the draft Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/877  Respondent: 15245921 / Rachel Cunningham  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• Statement of objection.
  ◦ I object to the large scale ‘strategic’ development proposed at Policy A46 which I consider to be inappropriate development.
  ◦ The Local Plan does not demonstrate any ‘exceptional circumstances’ that warrant Normandy’s removal from the Green Belt.

• Need for a secondary school in Normandy.
  ◦ I question the need for a secondary school to be placed specifically in Normandy. I have not seen any evidence, either from GBC or SCC that supports this requirement.
  ◦ I understand from my county councillor (Cllr K Witham) that there is an abundance of pupil places available at other secondary schools in the area to the west of Guildford. Some of these schools also have capacity to expand in the future. Why has this not been fully considered as part of the Local Plan?
  ◦ If a further school is required, it could equally be built elsewhere within the borough. Normandy secondary school pupils already commute by train to schools in Guildford.
  ◦ With no requirement for a school in Normandy there is no requirement for 1100 homes.

• Access to Site A46.
I am concerned that the two lanes (Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane) that will provide access routes into the development are not fit for purpose. They are narrow, with bridge and tunnel restrictions. By their nature, the Lanes offer little opportunity for improvement in order to provide safe transit of vehicles and pedestrians alike, this is particularly so with what will be a significant increase in traffic.

- **Traveller and show people plots.**
  - Normandy already has a high percentage of sites within its parish compared with others across the borough. **Policy A49** seeks to grant permanent permission to a site that has had temporary retrospective planning permission since 2009. Why is it proposed to increase the number of these sites still further in Normandy when other parishes could share the responsibility?

- **Increased provision for GPs and Dental surgeries in Normandy (Appendix C - HSC).**
  - Residents of Normandy are currently served by The Fairlands medical practice for GP and dental services, with a small surgery and pharmacy outlet in Normandy.
  - To gain an appointment to see a doctor of choice in Normandy currently takes in excess of 2 weeks.
  - As proposed, the development would double the size of the village and have the consequence of placing considerable extra burden on an already stretched facility. Why therefore has no consideration been given to enlarging this medical provision under **Appendix C – HSC**?

- **Environment.**
  - I am very concerned at the impact that a proposed development of this size would have on the local environment for flora and fauna. There is no evidence in the Local Plan of acceptance or mitigation of what permanent effect this proposed development would have. The proposed development is within close proximity to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/887  **Respondent:** 15247233 / Alex Evans  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?**

( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed development outlined for A46. It is a disproportionately large development which will change the nature of the village of Normandy forever. There has not been enough consultation with local people on this matter. I feel that Guildford Borough Council has decided to push a large proportion of proposed new housing into Normandy/Flexford rather than looking at other sites, especially brownfield ones. The green belt should remain as it is. It should be sacrosanct and not tinkered with. There are no clear or special circumstances by which it is necessary to build upon the green belt. Although other areas of housing have been identified across the borough, the largest proportion allocated close to existing communities is here in Normandy. This is unfair and the rest of the borough should bear the burden more equally - if indeed so many extra houses are really needed (see my comment below).

There is also real concern about the impact on infrastructure that the proposed development will have. Traffic is already very bad during busy periods, and the small roads in the local area cannot support further traffic. Pollution from road traffic will also affect the local population and local wildlife.

The noise, dust and road traffic problems caused during a protracted period of building in this area will also affect families who are trying to get on with normal lives in a currently very peaceful area.

I question the accuracy of statistics that state that the population of Guildford will grow to the extent that the number of homes suggested here and across the rest of the local plan will be needed. The numbers of short-term visitors, especially university students have skewed the statistics and are giving false indications as to how many extra homes are really required.
The inclusion of many new traveller pitches in the proposed site is also a concern. The fact that there are already a number of traveller sites in the Normandy area does not mean that more should be added. These allocations are not being spread evenly across the borough. This proposal risks pigeonholing our area the borough as specifically traveller-heavy areas and this is not acceptable.

Ours is a beautiful and semi-rural community. It should not be overwhelmed by a housing development that is too large and does not have the support of the local community, myself included.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1372  Respondent:  15248481 / Jamie McCallister  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.

With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become even more biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/940  Respondent:  15254369 / Nick Sargent  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This is my response to Guildford Borough Council’s draft plan. I strongly OBJECT to the plan as it currently stands. Specifically, I am deeply concerned by the proposal of site A46 in the Green Belt. The current proposal is grossly inappropriate, unsustainable and arguably not legal. Please see below my points of objection:

No demand for a new school:

• Have the council proved that a new school is required? Several local schools according to Keith Witham a local councillor are undersubscribed and if new places were required would be willing to expand if they became fully subscribed. A school is being built in Mayford which has not yet been completed. Is a further school required?
• It is would be more cost effective to extend existing schools to reduce the risk of an empty school given that surrounding schools are under subscribed and birth rates have dropped in recent years.
• GBC itself previously stated that Blackwell farm would be a better location for a new school if required. Why the sudden change of heart? Could this be because of pressure from Taylor Wimpey.
• I question the legality of a school being an enabler and a trump card for development on the green belt as stated by Cllr Paul Spooner.
• When will the school be built? If the houses are built first then all the children would have to go to other schools, negating the requirement for a school.
• When will the train station be built? If it is built after the school and homes how would children and staff get to school? They will drive adding further traffic and cause chaos on the local roads.
• A recent freedom of information outlined that the government does not know how many kids there will be. How can we propose let alone develop a school without accurate forecasts/predictions.

Too many homes being proposed:

• The proposal of over 1000 homes, retail space and a new school would dramatically change the nature of the village beyond recognition. Normandy and Flexford are semi-rural villages with a few hundred houses. The proposed development would change these villages into urbanised areas.
• The proposal of 1,100 homes seems an odd number to suggest and I have not seen any rationale or justification for this figure. I would strongly recommend investigating the calculation of this number. In addition, I call for a review of the SHMA as it appears to have been disproportionality impacted by Surrey University student needs.
• Why have GBC chosen larger sites instead of smaller sites where 30-50 homes could be developed? This would be easier to sustain and fairer on local communities.

Lack of current infrastructure and any proposals to improve it:

• There is a lack of infrastructure to support such a large scale development with the roads around A46 essentially being country lanes. The new school and homes would add hundreds of cars to roads which are already beyond the capacity they were designed to sustain.
• There is not a robust infrastructure plan to support GBC plan. Nothing in the plan suggests how this additional traffic would be managed. I am concerned about road safety with many of the roads having poor visibility due to blind corners, blind humps, no lighting, invisible entrances and poorly maintained bridges. We already have a speeding problem in the area this development would increase the problem. As a parent of young children this really concerns me.
• The plan mentions nothing about the impact of 1100 homes and 1500 pupils/200 staff on the A323 which is already a road struggling to cope with the traffic capacity and such development would push it beyond its designed capacity.
• The funding included within the proposal for infrastructure improvements is insufficient. This would not cover new bridges and crossing on Westwood and Glaziers Lane which would be required to manage the significant increase in traffic particularly HGVs and buses.
• No consideration has been given to the impact on the already busy Fairlands surgery in the area.

Lack of engagement on proposal and unjustified Green Belt development:

• Why don’t residents get to decide the future of their communities? We have never been consulted on what we would like to have developed in our area. No options have been presented other than 1100 homes. My understanding is that the localisation act and National Planning Policy Framework states that locals should be involved and have local consultations? There has been no meaningful engagement and the engagement recently has been at arm’s length and notification rather than consultation. My understanding is that the application by Taylor Wimpey to develop A46 was made 2 years ago. Plenty of time to have fully engaged local residents.
• The GBC proposal fails the NPFF due to the lack of meaningful engagement and disregard for the Green Belt without providing any exceptional circumstances.
• Why do other improvements to the area have to be included in the plan, can they not be developed anyway? I.e. improvements to the Christmas Pie Trail.

Site A46 is not safeguarded and should be proposed and developed in the same plan:

• Site A46 is not currently safeguarded. It was proposed but never approved. Can a site be proposed for safeguarding and developed in the same plan? My understanding is that this is not allowed.
• Site A46 appears to have been a last minute addition to the plan. It appears to have poorly thought through.
• Normandy and Flexford are a key sites to stop urban sprawl and Ash, Tongham, Aldershot and Guildford merging. It represents exactly what the green belt was created to do.
The funding is questionable:
- How is the plan being funded? It seems to be overwhelming funded by developers. Is this impartial or legal?

The plan lacks credibility:
- The proposal by GBC considers both Normandy and Flexford as one settlement (sustainability) in one section and two in another (sensitivity). This is inconsistent and undermines the validity and credibility of the proposal. This appears to have been done by GBC to get a specific outcome. By separating the two villages the sensitivity is lower as the land in between is disregarded.

The plan will detrimentally impact the quality of life of many people:
- The A46 proposal will have a significant detrimental impact on the quality of life of local residents. I am a father of two young girls and I am deeply concerned about the impact this will have on my family. We moved to Flexford for the countryside and community. The plans will cause the countryside to be destroyed including some wonderful wildlife and change the character of the community. During the development which will last years it will cause disruption to our lives, with the increase in pollution, noise and make the roads dangerous with the number of HGVs being required.

The development would increase pollution:
- I would be concerned for the health of my family if the proposal was to go ahead due to the increase in traffic pollution both during the development and once completed.
- The proposal would significantly increase in light pollution from the development on the SAONB.

Endangered wildlife would be destroyed:
- There are many endangered species in site A46 which would be destroyed by the development including but not limited to:
  - Hedgehogs
  - Owls
  - Sky Larks
  - Stag beetles
  - Adders

The flood risk would increase:
- The area is supported by Victorian sewage systems which would be pushed beyond design capacity with any new development of this scale.
- Normandy and Flexford often suffer from flooding. A46 is important in reducing the flood risk as it acts as a natural soak away.
- A46 is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area.
- There is a stream located near to site A46 at Manor Fruit Farm. If concreted over this will have severe impact on flooding.

Listed buildings would be impacted:
- There are 2x Grade 2 listed buildings very close to the proposed site of the development at A46. These have not been considered within the proposal.

The objections above relate to the overall policy and site A46. To call out some specific GBC policies that the objections relate:

S1, S2, H1, H2, H3, P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, E5, E6, E7, E9, D4, I1, P12, P13 and P14.
The arguments outline above demonstrate that the current plan is not fit for purpose and site A46 should be removed from the proposal.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1165</th>
<th>Respondent: 15258337 / Stephen Bourne</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am responding to the proposal A46 for the doubling in size of the village of Normandy which I believe to be unsound.

If as part of a well researched plan there is believed to be a need for a new village/town to be created this needs to be clearly stated and a case made for it and the location chosen. This has not happened in this case. On the basis of a desire by a commercial company to make money a devise (the provision of a secondary school) has been suggest to get around the green belt legislation. If you take a walk over the proposed site you will seeing beautiful Surrey countryside, agriculturally productive and support large amounts of wildlife. If you go there of a spring evening you may here the nightingale that has returned to the same coppice for so many years. For the sake of a need to comply with a bureaucratic planning requirement you will be doing completely unnecessary harm. By all means continue to add 10 or 20 houses a year to the village (and others) as has happened over the last number of years. Organic growth can be absorbed, dumping large ill thought out and under resourced developments without massive new infrastructure (which seems not to have been considered) cannot.

Please reject this proposal. Do not destroy our village and our lives for the next twenty years.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1057</th>
<th>Respondent: 15262209 / J H Brown</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Normandy Flexford Development Objection

This is a flood plain area with overflow from Worplesdon Pirbright.

School, 1,100 houses, traveller site - I don't think so.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
I object very strongly to the proposed development which makes no realistic assessment of the impact it will have on a valuable section of greenbelt both for the existing community and a large group who use it as a recreational resource.

In particular I am gravely concerned about the effect on local roads which are already under great pressure and will not cope with the significant additional burden.

I appreciate that GBC will encounter objections wherever development is proposed and probably views it as less difficult to try and manage a small number of larger developments than many small ones. However, for this proposed site, the extent and nature of the change is far beyond that which any community could reasonably be expected to accept.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object vehemently to the proposed development on this site which seems to me to be the most extraordinarily inappropriate and ill conceived of all the proposals in the draft Local Plan. This is Green Belt land, previously identified as a “red” site of high sensitivity, and the change appears to be predicated purely on the basis of a developer having come forward with a plan, money, and arguments unsupported by evidence.

The sheer scale of the proposal is audacious and totally impractical. Quite apart from the fact that it would destroy the character of our quiet, rural village, and destroy our very special countryside and wild life, the infrastructure is simply incapable of supporting any significant development, let alone something of this scale.
There is clear evidence that there is absolutely no need for an additional secondary school in the area. The neighbouring secondary schools are currently under-subscribed, King’s College by as much as 57%. The New Guildford University Technical College will open in 2018, and both King’s College and Ash Manor have scope to increase their capacity if they reach 100% of their current capacities. Christ’s College also has space, capacity and willingness to expand its intake, and other schools in Ash and Woking can also offer places to Guildford residents. There are thus many ways of meeting Guildford’s needs without going to the expense of building a new school at all, but even if there was a need, this is an entirely inappropriate site. Ignoring the circularity of the suggestion, even if the development went ahead, it would only generate a need for one form per year which could easily be accommodated within existing local schools. I hope that these arguments alone will be sufficient to ensure rejection of this proposed development. However, I would also draw attention to the impact on traffic, flooding and the Thames Basin Special Protection Area:

- **Traffic:** Our roads already take very heavy traffic during the morning and evening rush hours and grind to a halt when accidents on the A31 or A3 prompt motorists to detour via the A323 and Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane, the rural lanes on either side of the proposed site (each with pinch points at the railway crossings). As things are, it is not unusual for a morning journey from Normandy to Guildford to take over an hour. The impact of the proposal to close off access to Guildford via Farnham Road can only exacerbate matters, as will developments already planned in Aldershot. Adding 1100 new homes plus a school of up to 8 forms per year would simply turn the whole area into a huge permanent gridlock with traffic fumes killing any wildlife that had survived the development. The increase in traffic would not only affect Normandy but the whole of the surrounding area, from Guildford to Aldershot, including Ash, Wood Street Village and Park Barn.

- **Flooding:** Normandy has an extremely high water table and regularly experiences serious problems with flooding. The stream running across Westwood Lane, Glaziers Lane, Elmgrove Lane and under the A323 at Tickners Bridge frequently bursts its banks in a number of places. My house has been completely flooded internally on a number of occasions and we have personally spent a lot of money over the years improving our flood resilience as well as benefitting from supportive measures taken by GBC. However, we are very dependent on the capacity of Normandy’s fields and trees to absorb surface water during the growing months and of the fields to provide water storage space in the winter. Building over the fields will take away this capacity and overload the stream, with consequent flooding at vulnerable points such as the restricted bridges at Glaziers Lane and Elmgrove Lane. Such flooding is highly likely to flood houses internally and to block road traffic. Recent improvements to protect the Beech Lane residents from perpetual flooding have been designed on the basis of current arrangements ie with the fields between Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane as a buffer, so the downstream risk will be further heightened if this development goes ahead.

The additional housing is also being suggested as a solution to the apparent problem that Normandy and Flexford have lost shops and pubs “due to insufficient populations to support them”. For many years in the past, with smaller populations, our village did sustain shops and pubs. Their demise is far more likely to result from changed behaviour and different needs: cars, internet, smoking bans, etc have significantly altered the way people shop and socialise nowadays. If you ask the people of Normandy whether the provision of a few shops and pubs is worth the destruction of our countryside, wildlife and the character of our village, the answer would undoubtedly be a resounding “no”.

The name of Normandy is believed to derive from “no man’s land”, reflecting the openness of our area. Normandy is, and should remain, a vital “green lung” separating the potential urban spread from Guildford and Aldershot. Allowing 1100 new houses, a huge school, and other buildings to replace open countryside would strangle the whole area. The proposed site is within a stone’s throw of the Thames Basin Special Protection Area. Normandy, Pirbright and Ash residents are close enough to access the firing areas before and after shooting finishes and many of us do use the whole area regularly. This is such a special and lovely place to walk, ride and cycle, that it is inconceivable that, irrespective of any SANG provision, many of the new residents would not also make regular use of it – and, indeed, why should they not once they had moved into the area?

For all these reasons, this extraordinary and wholly inappropriate proposal should be rejected and taken out of the proposed Local Plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
## Comment ID: pslp172/2628  Respondent: 15264065 / Roshan Bailey  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( )  **Sound?** ( )  **Legally Compliant?** ( )

I wholeheartedly support the removal of the proposals for Site A46 from the Local Plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

## Comment ID: PSLPS16/1082  Respondent: 15265377 / Emma Thompson  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( )  **Sound?** ( )  **Legally Compliant?** ( )

I am writing to you to **object** against the local development plan that has been proposed by Guildford Borough Council for the villages of Normandy and Flexford (Site A46/A47). You are proposing to build 1,100 new homes, a 1500 pupil secondary school, 6 show people pitches with yards and a nursing home in the rural villages of Normandy and Flexford. This massive development will be built on a huge area of Green Belt land. There are many issues that have been overlooked by you and I am not fully convinced you realise the implications of this build.

The land proposed is a vast square of green belt land, I don’t think I have ever seen such a large piece of Green Belt land sacrificed for development in this area before. If this build goes ahead it will destroy ancient woodland, including 500 year old oak trees that line the old drive of Westwood Place which is a listed building. This drive is now a public footpath and was once joined to Windsor Great Park, the land is steeped in history. The build will disturb defenceless wildlife which will struggle to thrive if forced to move and it will also destroy hedgerows and grasslands resulting in a decline in our bird and bee populations, which are already under threat. There is a proposal to create an area to move the wildlife too which is idiotic. Wildlife will stand a better chance if they are left alone in their natural habitat rather than forced out and ultimately destroyed. This build will change green fields into a large urban sprawl and therefore encroaching on the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The build will also destroy valuable agricultural land when the UK has already lost a total 2000sq kilometres in the last six years. The area is very prone to flooding and is saved most winters by the surrounding natural streams taking most of the brunt of the rain, a natural flood defence. The site would be built directly over these streams. Where would the water go? Most probably into the homes of Normandy and Flexford residents. Flooding has always been a problem in Normandy, increasing housing would only increase the risk.

This build will increase the number of homes in Normandy and Flexford by 100% each of these homes is likely to have at least one car and so the traffic situation in the area will be chaotic. In addition the proposed 1500 pupil secondary school will also add to a distavorous traffic situation during drop off and pick up times. The road infrastructure around Normandy and Flexford would not be able to cope with this drastic increase in traffic, vast number of homes will be caged in by a single lane railway bridge which will result in daily lengthy tail backs. This increase in traffic will choke a village blessed with clean air by increasing pollution, especially at peak times, risking the health of Normandy and Flexford residents. This proposed build is likely to take 15 years so not only will the end result cause a dramatic change in the road situations in the area but it will cause 15 years of disruptions, fumes, dust, traffic lights, road works and it wouldn’t surprise me if you saw a rise in illnesses within the village especially in the elderly and young as a result in this rise of pollution.

Normandy and Flexford are rural villages. This new proposal will merge them into one Normandy town, killing the rural feel and community forever. I understand the need for new homes in our country, I am 29 years old and getting on the housing ladder will always be a struggle, especially in the Surrey area but I do not understand how GBC can overlook so many brownfield sites that we have in the area and think it logical to ignore these and destroy our wonderful countryside and build on Green Belt Land instead. There are many more area options for this build, if it is actually needed, that do not
encroach on Green Belt land and I am confident that you have a good idea of these areas also. In my opinion GBC have taken the easy way out and this proposal is developer led as there was no mention of A46/A47 in the 2014 consolation and in fact this site was safeguarded so this is only in place because a developer has approached the council and offered them a secondary school in order to build their homes which has no respect for the principals of town and country planning.

The need for secondary school on site A46/A47 has not been proven. Every neighbouring secondary school to Normandy is currently unsubscribed and the birth rate which raised in 2011 and 2012 has now reduced so there seems no real need for a new school as we should just be using the spaces available already.

**Kings College** is 57% undersubscribed and if it does reach full capacity there is options for the school to be further expanded to accommodate new pupils.

**The New Guildford University Technical College** is opening in 2018 and will take 240 pupils from the age of 14 in its first year doubling to 480 places.

**Christ College** is taking 30 extra pupils a year as it has the capacity to do so and is willing to take more.

**Ash Manor** is undersubscribed by 110 and are supportive of the school being expanded to take more pupils in future. Ash Manor are also very concerned with the prospect of a new secondary school being built just three miles away from them as it will surely effect the amount of new pupils coming to their school.

**Connaught School** is undersubscribe by 90 places.

**Hoe Valley, Woking** will have the capacity of 840, at the moment it only has 120.

In addition to these schools, **Guildford County School** and **St Peter’s School** have already had approval to expand, clearly creating more spaces in these schools also.

The need for a new secondary school in Guildford Borough therefore seems unnecessary and there is no reason for one to be built in Normandy. If you wish to proceed with this proposal of a new secondary school the SCC Education officers need to demonstrate a clear need for a school at this location.

Surrey County Councils policy, dating back to March 2013 states that ‘We will maintain the Green Belt, Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and other environmental protections, and create a new designation – similar to SSSIs – to protect green areas of particular importance to local communities.’

And the SCC resolves

1. To use its power to protect Surrey’s Green Belt.
2. To support the National Planning Policy Framework (section 9 – paragraphs 79 to 92) and the Government’s policy of protecting the Green Belt.
3. To make Surrey’s MPs and the County’s Districts and Boroughs aware of this resolution.
4. That any Green Belt development in the County is in line with the needs and wishes of Surrey residents

I do hope these pledges and policies do not fall short as at the moment they are not being followed and the Local Plan does not concur with them. I do hope that GBC will not let a community down by destroying its Green Belt, its wildlife and its rural village feel for ever. We are all so very lucky to live in such a wonderful area of outstanding natural beauty, I do not believe any of us have the right to destroy this land so I ask you to reconsider the Local Plan and site A46/A47 as your arguments do not weigh up and there are clearly more negatives then positives for Normandy, Flexford and Guildford Borough.

Finally I sate again that I OBJECT to the proposed plan for site A46 and A47.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the removal of green belt planning restrictions on the land proposed for development in Normandy (A46) as most of the key criteria for green belt status apply to this area.

I object to the proposals to add 1100 new homes and a new school in the Normandy area as the road network in Normandy and the surrounding areas (where I live) will not be able to sustain the volume of traffic that this housing development plus additional school journeys will bring. There are no highway improvements that can conceivably be made to these country lanes that would convert them to the A-class roads needed to serve the proposed development and additional traffic going to the school. The traffic pressures on Glaziers Lane, Westwood lane, Wanborough Hill, the B3000 and the A31 have built up tremendously over the last few years and there are frequent long queues on Wanborough Hill and the B3000 during rush hour periods and it also now happening at other times during the working day. The roads in this area are not adequate to cope with current traffic volumes now, let alone the impacts of proposed significant additional developments at Normandy (A46), Ash & Tongham (A29) and Ash Green plus others just downstream off the A3 at Blackwell Farm (A26) and Onslow Village A11, A15 & A16) which would also influence traffic knock on impacts. I retired in 2010 and could leave and return to our house in Wanborough at any time of day without encountering significant queues apart from during well defined short rush hours whereas now I regularly have to queue on Wanborough Hill and the B3000 at almost any time of day.

I believe the West Surrey Housing SHMA used by Guildford Borough Council as a fundamental rationale for the removal of Green Belt status from Normandy, Flexford and various other local areas now proposed for development was significantly overestimated and has not been subjected to sufficient rigorous checks about its accuracy.

In addition events have now moved on and the current consensus of independent economic forecasters is that the short to medium term UK's (and hence South East's) growth forecast has significantly reduced from previous forecasts due to the likely impacts of Brexit uncertainties on the economy. These reductions of likely growth trends as well as probable changes to population movements have not been factored into the local planning process yet and both these factors are likely to reduce some of the demand for additional new housing.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? (No), is Sound? (No), is Legally Compliant? (No)

Please see attached statement

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: Site objection – Glaziers Lane (Strawberry Farm).docx (157 KB)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1134  Respondent: 15273249 / Valerie Cheesman  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? (No), is Sound? (No), is Legally Compliant? (No)

We strongly object to policy's A46, A47 and A49 in the Draft Local Plan June 2016

1. Taylor Wimpey has been proposing this development for at least 3 years. Their early submissions proposed 600, then 700, then 1100 houses. This is entirely developer led and has no basis in empirical logic. Taylor Wimpey has funded all the reviews of flooding, transport and structural proposals and this lacks objectivity.
2. Safeguarded land according to NPPF should not be developed within the term of the plan in which it is allocated. Therefore this land even if it was safeguarded should remain undeveloped for a period of between 10-15yrs the term of the new plan.
3. The insetting of Normandy/Flexford (Removal from the Green Belt) is unlawful. The Green Belt is to stop urban sprawl, by insetting it allows urban sprawl.
4. The A46 site was proposed for safeguarding. It was not actually safeguarded. Safeguarding is a category of land for long term development and is available to the council should it be needed. Land has to be formerly safeguarded in a plan and as part of it. This was not the case and the land remains as sensitive green belt land.
5. There is no case in law which supports the argument that a school trumps green belt status. This is entirely objective on the part of planning policy.
6. The argument that Normandy/Flexford do not contribute to the openness of the green belt is incorrect. There is no foundation for this statement. It is entirely based on the need to inset the village.
7. Transport improvements are very vague and will be from developer profit. 3 Million has been earmarked to improve the Aldershot Road, Wanborough Hill and A31 access. This is way below what will be required and the road system is utterly unable to cope with this proposal.
8. A46 has been designated as not a flood risk. It is a flood plain as can be seen from the vegetation that grows there, willow trees, reeds, etc. and floods on a regular basis.
9. Boundaries under NPPF definition need to be examined. They need to be natural, permanent and defensible. The island boundary at Palm Nurseries is none of these.
10. The process is flawed and there is no adherence to NPPF legislative proposals.

Conclusion this is unlawful.

Any development on these plots would have a detrimental affect on habitats and wildlife that use these areas of land and in some cases could contribute to the national and local decline of a number of these species. This would be a great loss not only to all the residents who live in the Parish, but also visitors who come and enjoy the natural beauty of the countryside by walking, riding and cycling along many bridleways, public rights of way and permissive footpaths.

These are some of the wildlife recorded.

Hedgehog, Stoat, Weasel, Wood mouse, Field vole, Bank vole, Water vole,
Dormouse, Badger, Fox, Roe deer, Rabbit, Barn owl, The red kite,
Little owl, Tawny owl, Fieldfare, Redwing, Song thrush, Mistle thrush, Skylark, Linnnet, Goldfinch, Reed bunting, Yellowhammer. Green woodpecker, Great spotted woodpecker, Nuthatch, Buzzard, Sparrowhawk, Grey heron, Common lizard, Grass snake, Adder, Slow worm, Common toad, Common Frog, Smooth newt, Palmate newt.

Butterflies

Red Admiral, Meadow brown, Ringlet, Grayling, Holly blue, Small blue, Brimstone, Small copper.

Not forgetting the Stag beetle, Banded demoiselle damselfly, Beautiful demoiselle, damselfly.

It should be noted that the area mentioned A47 is an SNCI. The Flax Pond and stream at Little Flexford have records of Water voles (a very rare and protected species, and great crested newts also a European Protected Species.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:  

---

**Comment ID: PSLPS16/1138**  **Respondent:** 15274049 / Simon Gimson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to object to the inclusion in the draft Local Plan of the area between Flexford and Normandy (Site A46). I object for the following reasons:

1. This is a sensitive site within the Green Belt. This was recognised when Guildford Borough Council listed it as having high sensitivity in Green Belt terms. The development would effectively merge Normandy and Flexford and create an urban area between Guildford and Ash.

2. I cannot understand why the developer has included the provision of a new secondary school. No evidence of need for school places in this location has been provided and the local County Councillor has discovered that there is spare capacity at existing schools. The argument therefore seems very cynical and creates a circular argument - we need the school so we need the houses and vice versa.

3. Although there is a train station adjacent to the site the transport infrastructure is inadequate for the traffic which will be generated by the construction phase and once complete. The Aldershot road and access up Wanborough hill to the A31 (Hogs Back) are routes which are already congested in peak hours and any additional traffic will cause significant problems.

4. The increased population from this development would add to the pressure on local wildlife. Domestic cats are already a problem for the local bird population along with the disturbance of dogs being exercised on the Ash Ranges area. The small areas provided in the development will be inadequate for the numbers pets which will be resident in the proposed development. I believe the area I referred to as Ash Ranges is technically the Thames Basin Special Protection Area.

I hope that GBC will now remove this site from the draft local plan. There are better sites within Surrey for this type of development although developers probably make good returns from this type of site.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:  

---

**Comment ID: PSLPS16/1141**  **Respondent:** 15274337 / Darryl Taylor  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

---
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? (No), is Sound? (No), is Legally Compliant? (No)

The land of the proposed development is greenbelt and should not be built on.
There is no need for a secondary school as all the surrounding schools are under used.
The area is a floodplain.
The surrounding roads will not take the extra traffic.
The sewage system is overloaded at present and will not take any further homes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6230  Respondent: 15274497 / Anne Lyon  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am very concerned about the proposed development in Normandy.

Firstly, at present there is no need for another secondary school in the area. Both the nearest schools, Ash Manor and King’s College, are not oversubscribed so the only necessity to build a new school would be to accommodate the potential residents of the new undesired development.

This highlights the fact that this is a developer led campaign whose plans to build the school is what has been described as the 'trump card’ when it comes to pushing developments through planning. It is a cause for concern that the planning policy is being dominated by a developer who does not have to take responsibility for the aftermath of this project. Their prime considerations will always be the profits such a scheme will generate with little thought of any other factors.

A further concern is how the roads of the area will cope. I accept that there is a station in the locality but even now many people choose to drive into Guildford rather than catch the train. At present it takes me an average time of 25 minutes to reach the school where I work despite it only being 3.5 miles away. By 7.45 both the A3 and the A31 are at a standstill and remain that way until beyond 9 o’clock. The Aldershot road is also snarled up at this time. The roads in this area cannot withstand the traffic that will be generated by this development.

Additionally, it can be assumed that many of the potential households will own dogs. The exercise of so many more pets will put intolerable pressure on the wildlife of the Thames Basin which harbours many rare species as well as the remaining green belt areas in Normandy.

Furthermore, this land is good agricultural land that is currently being used for crops and livestock which begs the question why it has been designated as an exceptional circumstance for removing from the green belt protection. Not only that but this land is waterlogged throughout most of the year and I cannot imagine that the existing drainage will cope with any impact this development will bring.

I hope you will take all these concerns into consideration.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/1150  Respondent: 15274721 / Ann Bourne  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I believe the plans to build over 1000 houses and a school in such a small village is far too ambitious for such a small community. The key reasons are that the land in question is largely in the green belt (a precious commodity that must be guarded), the surrounding roads and village infrastructure cannot possibly support such major growth in our village, and there would be a significant and very sudden change to the nature of Normandy and Flexford. I am not against development, and those small housing developments which have taken place in the nearly 30 years we have lived here have been delivered effectively and without a major jarring impact on either community or infrastructures. Building on land that has come available - to fill in when a pub has closed, or a small church has been taken down, or after the rebuild of the village hall - have meant that probably in the region of 40 new homes have been added and welcomed into our community. However, this level of development will fundamentally change our home, and will completely overwhelm our roads, our surgery, our churches and change a tranquil rural neighbourhood into a bustling suburban space. It is insensitive and unnecessary.

Ann Bourne

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1183  Respondent: 15278689 / F Robertson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Dear Sirs,

I wish to make clear I do not favour the development proposal Policy A46 for the following reasons:

The land is not 'safeguarded' for planning; it is still in the Green Belt and no special circumstances have been produced to suggest it should not remain so.

The need for a secondary school in Normandy has not been proven, but the school is the basis of the development. If the school requirement is not proven (some nearby secondary schools are undersubscribed and none are over-subscribed), the need for the houses to be there is also not proven. So there is no need locally for a school or so many houses.

The development site is within a kilometre of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area, when that protection area extends for five kilometres, so the development is in direct conflict and disregard of the TBHSPA.

The proposed area for SANG at Russell Farm would mean the loss of fine agricultural land for an inadequate scheme that even National Heritage can't approve. Plus the likelihood of 2000 new Normandy residents travelling that distance to walk their dogs, rather than resorting to the much closer, larger, more attractive heathland, is slim.

Please note this potential SANG is not large enough to fulfil SANG requirements (that one can walk for at least a kilometre without recrossing one's path in the process), it is not within easy walking distance of the community it is proposed to serve (ie Normandy residents) and it is not required by the residents of Wood Street, where it is situated. It appears as merely a sop to the planners, rather than a well-thought out alternative to the huge loss of the productive agricultural land outlined in Policy A46.

The development Policy A46 requires adequate roads to service it. But the land under consideration is bordered by two country lanes - Glaziers Lane and Westborough Lane. Those lanes are edged with houses. Widening them, therefore, is impossible, so how they are to be made 'adequate' for double the traffic they carry already? It couldn't be done in the necessary timescale; it's doubtful it could be done at all. There are also two railway bridges on these lanes. One is a narrow, 'blind' hump-backed bridge, the other, which goes over the road, reduces the lane to a single car, requiring folk to wait and give way. It is easy to see how double the traffic down either lane will result in traffic jams and even accidents.
The development outlined in Policy A46 will also require adequate sewage provision. Thames Water has admitted that this is currently at capacity in Normandy and residents of Glaziers Lane can see it is in excess of capacity during heavy rain, when sewage appears in their gardens. The provision of a fit-for-purpose sewage system that can cope with the current population is urgently needed and overdue. If Thames Water can't manage this, it is not doubtful they could manage the sewage output of another 1100 homes in the same area? A public health disaster awaits.

Overall, Policy A46 would change the village from a collection of hamlets currently separated by the Green Belt to double its size and destroy its current character in the process. As a resident of some twenty-five years, I do not oppose modest development in Normandy and indeed have seen some that I support, especially the provision of social housing near the village hall, the private development on Westwood Lane where once a garage stood, and the thoughtful housing association homes in Beech Lane. They were on a human scale and they haven't badly affected the village.

But Policy A46 will. It is clearly developer led, rather than locally desired, or socially aware, and will please only those who have the money to buy houses at the current inflated rate, the landowner who stands to earn a million pounds an acre when he sells his current agricultural land as building land, and the developers who will reap the profits of an inflated housing market.

It leads one to muse upon why those elected to represent local people promote schemes that local people do not want, but developers and landowners do.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5650 Respondent: 15278689 / F Robertson Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to make clear I do not favour the development proposal Policy A46 for the following reasons:

The land is not 'safeguarded' for planning; it is still in the Green Belt and no special circumstances have been produced to suggest it should not remain so.

The need for a secondary school in Normandy has not been proven, but the school is the basis of the development. If the school requirement is not proven (some nearby secondary schools are undersubscribed and none are over-subscribed), the need for the houses to be there is also not proven. So there is no need locally for a school or so many houses.

The development site is within a kilometre of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area, when that protection area extends for five kilometres, so the development is in direct conflict and disregard of the TBHSPA.

The proposed area for SANG at Russell Farm would mean the loss of fine agricultural land for an inadequate scheme that even National Heritage can't approve. Plus the likelihood of 2000 new Normandy residents travelling that distance to walk their dogs, rather than resorting to the much closer, larger, more attractive heathland, is slim.

Please note this potential SANG is not large enough to fulfil SANG requirements (that one can walk for at least a kilometre without recrossing one's path in the process), it is not within easy walking distance of the community it is proposed to serve (ie Normandy residents) and it is not required by the residents of Wood Street, where it is situated. It appears as merely a sop to the planners, rather than a well-thought out alternative to the huge loss of the productive agricultural land outlined in Policy A46.

The development Policy A46 requires adequate roads to service it. But the land under consideration is bordered by two country lanes - Glaziers Lane and Westborough Lane. Those lanes are edged with houses. Widening them, therefore, is impossible, so how they are to be made 'adequate' for double the traffic they carry already? It couldn't be done in the necessary timescale; it's doubtful it could be done at all. There are also two railway bridges on these lanes. One is a narrow, 'blind' hump-backed bridge, the other, which goes over the road, reduces the lane to a single car, requiring folk to wait and give way. It is easy to see how double the traffic down either lane will result in traffic jams and even accidents.
The development outlined in Policy A46 will also require adequate sewage provision. Thames Water has admitted that this is currently at capacity in Normandy and residents of Glaziers Lane can see it is in excess of capacity during heavy rain, when sewage appears in their gardens. The provision of a fit-for-purpose sewage system that can cope with the current population is urgently needed and overdue. If Thames Water can't manage this, it is not doubtful they could manage the sewage output of another 1100 homes in the same area? A public health disaster awaits.

Overall, Policy A46 would change the village from a collection of hamlets currently separated by the Green Belt to double its size and destroy its current character in the process. As a resident of some twenty-five years, I do not oppose modest development in Normandy and indeed have seen some that I support, especially the provision of social housing near the village hall, the private development on Westwood Lane where once a garage stood, and the thoughtful housing association homes in Beech Lane. They were on a human scale and they haven't badly affected the village.

But Policy A46 will. It is clearly developer led, rather than locally desired, or socially aware, and will please only those who have the money to buy houses at the current inflated rate, the landowner who stands to earn a million pounds an acre when he sells his current agricultural land as building land, and the developers who will reap the profits of an inflated housing market.

It leads one to muse upon why those elected to represent local people promote schemes that local people do not want, but developers and landowners do.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2668  Respondent: 15278689 / F Robertson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As a Normandy resident living in Christmas Pie, near the hamlet of Flexford, I am extremely relieved to see policy A46 abandoned. I felt it was planner-driven and unwarranted in terms of the needs of local residents. I am grateful that good sense prevailed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1189  Respondent: 15279201 / Keith Ruddock  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As a resident of Normandy I wish to register my objection to the proposal under the new draft Local Plan to release Site A46 from the Green Belt.
I do not believe that Guildford Borough Council have demonstrated the required "exceptional circumstances" to justify this proposed release within the Local Plan. The Local Plan does not adequately take into account the sensitive nature of the site or the impact on the local environment and no explanation has been given as to why this area is proposed for development as opposed to other more suitable locations within the Borough.
The local road and other transport infrastructure is already stressed and the proposed doubling in size of the local community would place huge additional pressure on an already overloaded road and transport system.
**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1226  **Respondent:** 15279329 / Bonnar Allan  **Agent:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document:</th>
<th>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( Yes )

The proposed strategic allocation does not comply with the objectives of sustainable development and should be removed from the Local Plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

- [160714 updated redline plan.pdf](#) (645 KB)
- [160718 Bonnar Allan Regulation 19 representation to Guildford BC July 2016.pdf](#) (440 KB)

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1265  **Respondent:** 15280737 / Miller Developments (David Milloy)  **Agent:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document:</th>
<th>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( No ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

The majority of the proposed allocation is considered to be in an area of High Green Belt Sensitivity which (with the exception of the area immediately adjacent to Normandy) scored very poorly in sustainability terms when assessed as part of the GBSC. The area to the north of the railway line, which comprises the majority of the allocation, is considered to be open in character.

It is understood that the Council has included this allocation on the back of a potential new secondary school the location of which is still to be determined. The resolution of Full Council in May 2016 noted that “this site is only included as a strategic site to support the provision of a new secondary school”, before going on to say that “this strategic site allocation be deleted should it be demonstrated that provision of such a school within this site is not required”.

It is unclear why the site was included in the Proposed Submission without first establishing beyond reasonable doubt that a secondary school is actually needed in this location, and securing such a confirmation from SCC as the Education Authority. Indeed, in its last submission to Guildford BC (in 2014), SCC said: “A site within the proposed urban extension at Blackwell Farm, with all necessary access infrastructure built in and a catchment surrounding the site, would be a more sustainable location in transport terms for a new secondary school to serve the western side of Guildford”.

As the supposed need for the secondary school is driving this allocation, it calls into question the whole Local Plan if one of the strategic sites (upon which the Council relies to deliver a sizeable portion of the OAN) is not certain to be taken forward as an allocation. if the site does not come forward the Council will have to go back to the drawing board in order to ensure it has a sufficient number of site allocations to meet the housing requirement over the Plan period.

The proposed site is bordered by an unclassified road (Glaziers Lane D60) on the east, a C-class road (Westwood Lane C16) on the west, and a railway line to the south. Whilst the allocation does benefit from access to Wanborough Station and existing bus routes along the Aldershot Road it is considered that the housing allocation and the seven-form entry secondary school would generate significant levels of private vehicle trips which will require significant improvements to the local highway network and the junctions with the Aldershot Road. It is not known whether any junction improvements with the A31 would be necessary. There are arguably no highway improvements that can conceivably be
made to the country lanes surrounding the development to convert them to the A-class roads needed to serve the proposed
development. The entry and exit from the A31 'Hogs Back' on to the B3000 to travel to and from the development site
via Wanborough Hill would be likely to ‘grid lock’ with the increased volume of traffic to and from the site and the
school.

There are also concerns at the failure of the Council to co-operate with other local authorities in respect of this site. In
2013 the development of 3,850 dwellings (population of approx. 9,000) in Aldershot was approved by Rushmoor
Borough Council and is situated about 4 miles from Normandy. The development, over a 15 year period, includes two
primary schools, and the provision of a SANG and many other provisions. The first phase of 228 dwellings, is now on
sale. Guildford BC objected to this development in 2013 (ref: 13/P/00108) on the grounds that insufficient information
had been provided to allow a full assessment on the impact of that development on the highways network and said "the
impact on Surrey's network and mitigation required has not been established". The Duty to Cooperate works both ways,
and given the objections which Guildford BC raised to the large scale development in Aldershot it is likely that similar
concerns could be raised in relation to the proposed large scale development at Normandy / Flexford.

Miller is concerned that should this allocation not come forward the Council’s housing requirement for the plan period
could not be achieved. On this basis, the Council has identified no fall-back position, thereby failing to make the
Proposed Submission legally compliant.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1246  Respondent: 15282017 / David Godman  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( No ), is Sound? ( No ), is
Legally Compliant? ( No )

I object to this 'strategic site' proposal as I believe it would completely change and destroy our local community. This will
massively increase in the population of Normandy over the plan period.

- The local roads are already at capacity at peak hours and with severally major accidents occurring on the A243
  road over the few years. There is limited scope for road improvements as both Glaziers lane and Westwood Lane
  have either a small humped back bridge or low/single track tunnel under the railway which would be both
technically and financially impossible to alter. However solving these problems would only transfer the traffic
  problem further along the line to the Hogs Back A31 and or A3 (Main roads already over loaded at peak times
  and made worse with more cars trying to a join a potentially fast moving road on a narrow slip road).
- This is a green belt site that is red sensitivity. Removing its green belt status and building 1,100 homes cannot be
  justified when these fields are within 3 kilometers of the Thames Basin Heaths special protection area. There
  need to be exceptional circumstances proven to remove land's green belt status. An up to 8 form entry secondary
  school is neither needed or 'exceptional circumstances'. The local plan states that 'Secondary educational need
  will be re-assessed at planning application stage' but if the houses have been built and there is no need found for
  a secondary school it will already be too late, the green belt will have been removed and the fields tarmacked
  and concreted over. Where will all the water that pours onto the Hogs back and Ash ranges go then, with no
  fields to soak it up? Glaziers Lane floods regularly as does Wanborough station without the addition of all that is
  proposed.
- There is no need for a secondary school as the two closest schools are undersubscribed and the building of
  houses cannot be used as a reason for a new school because the school is being used as an enabler for the
  building of the houses on green belt.
- The extra traffic that will be generated by an extra 1,100 homes and a secondary school will impact on every
  residents (present and future) lives, causing chaos on the roads. A Showmans site is proposed and the movement
  of their large equipment along the already described narrow lane, bridges and tunnels near impossible. This is a
developer led proposal that Normandy residents have not had an opportunity to comment on until this late stage
because this site did not appear in the 2014 version of the Draft Local Plan, so we were unable to make our needs and views known.

- The impact this proposal will have on wildlife is enormous. The Skylarks, Barn owls, Little owls, Cuckoos and other birds will lose their habitat. The Glow worms, Adders, Grass snakes and Slow worms will also. The light pollution from a development of this size will impact on our night skies, and the pets associated with these homes will also have a detrimental effect on the wildlife.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: I object Normandy Planning.pdf (226 KB)

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1256  
Respondent: 15282497 / C Axon  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ()  
Is Sound? (No)  
Is Legally Compliant? ()

I OBJECT to the local plan with regards to the proposed development at site A46 between Normandy and Flexford villages. My principle objections are mainly on grounds of sustainability and are:

- The transport infrastructure could not support it. There is no coherent transport policy within the local plan to make it viable.
- The assessment of sustainability for the competing sites was not sound. It was applied inconsistently and disregarded some important data.
- There is no proven need for secondary school that is being used as an “exceptional circumstance” to override objections to building on greenbelt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: Local Plan - Objection and Comments.docx (21 KB)

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1254  
Respondent: 15282785 / Timothy Pay  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? (No)  
Is Sound? (No)  
Is Legally Compliant? (No)

I object to the plan in relation to the proposals in A46. As a general overview it is a huge development that will destroy the local area in terms of environment, lifestyle and infrastructure. This proposal cannot be sound as it cannot be justified or delivered. Normandy is a small village of mainly bungalow style buildings. To add 1100 houses, shops and potentially a large secondary school would completely change the area from its current village feel to be a town. This is all proposed on a location that is within 800m of the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area and therefore all the protection that has been afforded the area has been disregarded by this part of the local plan.

The main and most worrying impact of the proposed development that cannot physically be addressed is the impact of all the extra traffic that will be generated by building 1100 homes and associated unwanted/unrequired shops and schools. This is also how the plan falls down in terms of its legal obligations. As far as I am aware Surrey County Council has not published a transport strategy and therefore it has not been considered when proposing this disproportionately sized development. The road system as it stands at the moment cannot cope with the current levels of traffic that feed from Aldershot towards Guildford and London. The A31 is always at a standstill for miles in the rush hours and therefore the roads that feed into them, Westwood Lane, the A323 will become gridlocked even further as a result. The thousands of homes being built in Aldershot on the site of the old army barracks will no doubt add to this traffic jam and as a result of...
this the pollution caused by thousands of cars idling in queues will cause a health risk to the residents. This is a failing on the plans duty to cooperate as they have not engaged with Rushmoor council to manage the extra traffic that will be caused when the 4000 houses currently under construction are finished.

Wyke primary school sits on the junction of Guildford Road and Westwood Lane and the health and safety of the children has not been considered by those planning A46. The children will be at danger from increasing numbers of cars passing through the area at drop off time and the air pollution will spike at this pinch point right at the corner of a busy road and oversized development.

Having watched the video 'What the draft local plans means to local people' I was hoping to find a balanced argument for and against from broad section of local residents. Instead the views were only expressed by those who stand to gain from the proposals, ie management at the hospital and University in Guildford. I would be amazed if any of the people interviewed were residents of the affected area of Normandy and facing the complete destruction of its character. I only moved to Normandy in January 2016 paying a premium to move from the urban environment of Ash to ensure that my two young daughters are brought up in a pleasant, safe and friendly environment. The charm of Normandy is that being a small village the atmosphere is one of neighbourhood, people are genuinely friendly and approachable. Children play in the streets with no fear of crime. If the proposal is agreed then it is inevitable that the standard of living will decrease and safety in terms of road collisions and crime will increase. Nobody who lives in Normandy wants this development to go ahead.

I object in the strongest possible terms to A46 being implemented. It is completely disporportionate in its size to the current village and will irrevocably destroy large swathes of countryside through urbanisation and traffic pollution.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to the proposed A46 strategic site at Normandy / Flexford for the following reasons:

1. 'Exceptional circumstances' for the removal of this site form the metropolitan green belt have not been demonstrated. The need for a new secondary school on the site is not an 'exceptional circumstance' to justify removal. The relationship between new dwellings and a new secondary school on the site is circular, thereby annulling the 'exceptional circumstance' argument. There is no proven need for a secondary school on this site at the expense of other alternatives which do not require the removal of land from the metropolitan green belt. GBC have not demonstrate that a combination of i) utilising under subscription to schools in the west of the borough ii) additional place from the already committed new Technical College and Hoe Valley school and iii) further development of existing schools would be a satisfactory alternative to the proposed secondary school on the A46 site.
1. This assessment has been enabled by inappropriate application of the NPPF concepts of sensitivity and sustainability in the decision to remove the site from the metropolitan green belt. Sensitivity considerations have been minimised and sustainability claims have been exaggerated for the following reasons i) The settlements of Normandy and Flexford have been treated as separate for the purpose of sensitivity, but treated as one for the purposes of sustainability. This has driven a different assessment of the site than if treated consistently across both concepts ii) mitigation to the threat to the Thames Basin Health Special Protection Area has not been demonstrated in the current plan - urbanisation will negatively impact on the the TBHSPA as a result iii) ecological networks and priority habitats under the NERC are not satisfactorily protected with the removal of the site from the metropolitan green belt iv) important views of the village (both daytime and nighttime) from the surrounding AONB landscape will not be protected by the urbanisation of the village v) there is no evidence to demonstrate that an estate development such as this will encourage significant retail and employment opportunities to offset the sensitivity considerations.

1. The ability to deliver the required improvement in local infrastructure has not been demonstrated. Key concerns are i) the removal of the environmental agency identified flood plain 3b without adequate improvement to the GBC surface water Management Plan ii) the inability of the unclassified roads surrounding the site to deal with the increased traffic from both the A46 site and also incremental traffic from Rushmoor Council's nearby house expansion iii) the as yet unfunded water supply and sewerage improvements that are required to deliver the site.

1. There has been no 'meaningful engagement' with local residents as is expected under the NPPF. Residents had been working on the assumption that this site would be a 'safeguarded site' per the 2014 draft local plan until GBC notified us of the change new proposal in April 2016. Sensitivity considerations have been minimised and sustainability claims have been exaggerated.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1268  Respondent: 15283745 / G Doven  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to register my objection to the GBC Local Plan affecting Normandy and Flexford and give the following reasons;

1. The plan as it stands appears to be developer led without any thought of the local community that the GLC is in place to serve.

2. There appears to be no consideration given or respect to the high quality green belt status currently in place.

3. Normandy and Flexford is a rural environment and is served with a rural environment infrastructure unsuited to major development.

4. The planned development does not take into account that it is surrounded by country lanes, Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane both of which are used as rat runs when the Hogs Back is at a standstill which is a regular occurrence and both of which are unsuited to developer and additional resident traffic.

5. Drainage and sewage facilities are barely able to manage with the current demands in place and flooding is an additional problem yet to be resolved.

6. The Guildford road that flanks the northern perimeter of the proposed development is currently at or very near full capacity with traffic volumes that frequently restrict access from Glaziers and Westwood lanes.
7. The proposed development is of size that is more suited to the convenience of GBC than the residents of Normandy and Flexford. A number of smaller developments distributed throughout the area would be more in-keeping with the rural environment.

8. There is no identifiable requirement for a new school as part of any new development in Normandy and Flexford as it has been confirmed that local schools in the area all have spare capacity and the will to expand their current capacities if required in the future.

9. The proposed development would build over areas much valued by local residents for dog walking, rambling and leisure activities.

10. The current plan is unsustainable, unsuitable and against the wishes of the local community.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1269  Respondent: 15283777 / Christine Doven  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to register my objection to the GBC Local Plan affecting Normandy and Flexford and give the following reasons;

1. The plan as it stands appears to be developer led without any thought of the local community that the GLC is in place to serve.

2. There appears to be no consideration given or respect to the high quality green belt status currently in place.

3. Normandy and Flexford is a rural environment and is served with a rural environment infrastructure unsuited to major development.

4. The planned development does not take into account that it is surrounded by country lanes, Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane both of which are used as rat runs when the Hogs Back is at a standstill which is a regular occurrence and both of which are unsuited to developer and additional resident traffic.

5. Drainage and sewage facilities are barely able to manage with the current demands in place and flooding is an additional problem yet to be resolved.

6. The Guildford road that flanks the northern perimeter of the proposed development is currently at or very near full capacity with traffic volumes that frequently restrict access from Glaziers and Westwood lanes.

7. The proposed development is of size that is more suited to the convenience of GBC than the residents of Normandy and Flexford. A number of smaller developments distributed throughout the area would be more in-keeping with the rural environment.

8. There is no identifiable requirement for a new school as part of any new development in Normandy and Flexford as it has been confirmed that local schools in the area all have spare capacity and the will to expand their current capacities if required in the future.

9. The proposed development would build over areas much valued by local residents for dog walking, rambling and leisure activities.
10. The current plan is unsustainable, unsuitable and against the wishes of the local community.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2175  Respondent: 15284385 / T.W. Turnill  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The area proposed for building 1100 houses in the Green Belt, designated Red agricultural land, which has been constantly used for grazing and livestock. The Government has repeatedly said that such land should NOT be used for building, unless there were overwhelming requirements to do so. These requirements have not been shown to exist in this village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2899  Respondent: 15284385 / T.W. Turnill  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We have been told that there is a need for a secondary School to the West of the County. The County Councillor for Normandy has consulted ALL the local schools, and their Heads have all confirmed that their own schools are undersubscribed, and would be able to accommodate any increase in pupil numbers with no difficulty. We have been told by Councillor Spooner that the main advantage of having the school in Normandy would be that the proposed Developer would build it for free, providing they were in turn allowed to build the 1100 houses on the Green Belt Land. The School is NOT required, and therefore the argument for the houses disappears with it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3411  Respondent: 15294817 / Rosie Thomas  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing in order to register my objection to the above proposal, and emphasise the unacceptable impact it would have on our community.

While I do accept the need for additional housing on a modest scale; definitely not the huge number proposed. This would double the size and completely change the character of our village – without including necessary amenities.
I see no plan for the provision of medical surgeries, shops, pubs, or facilities for young people. Indeed local services would not cope with the magnitude of the proposed expansion; my cottage is already subject to electricity cuts.

I challenge the view to build a new Secondary School: The need is not proven - our current schools are under subscribed. The Head teachers of both Ashmoor and Kings say no new school is necessary. Indeed they would cooperate in building extensions if, as and when necessary.

An enormous transport issue would result. Westwood and Glaziers are rural lanes including Grade 2 listed houses and would be unable to cope with the influx of 12/1500 pupils and 1100 houses! The railway bridge would also be an issue re height and route visibility. Existing road links A323 Guildford Road is currently saturated. School Lane with Wyke Primary School is already a dangerous spot.

Glaziers Lane already has sewage issues in respect to flooding:

Our environment is under the protection of the Thames Heath Basin considering the ecology of wildlife and prevention of light pollution.

I sincerely hope that Normandy’s voice is heard. The above proposal is clearly against the wishes and best interests of our existing community.

I trust it will not be taken forward.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

I strongly object to the proposals regarding the building of 1100 new homes and a school, in our very rural village of Normandy, as documented in the local plan.

Some of the reasons for my objection are:

I do not believe there to be a genuine need for a new secondary school in this area. Several of the existing schools are under subscribed, and some by a large number. In total the number of places available at these existing schools exceeds those that would be provided by a new school.

The land in question is green belt. This would seem to be yet another way to bend the rules and allow planning as an 'exception'. The exception being created by the need for the school. Surely for this to be the case a new school should be needed to educate the existing population of the area. The idea here seems to be that building 1100 new home may give rise to the need for a new school, which surely means that allowing a developer permission to build houses, thus creating this need, is somewhat loosely applying the exceptions rules.

Some years ago Normandy Parish Council, in association with GBC, commissioned a housing needs survey to establish whether there was a need for affordable housing in Normandy. Having analysed this report it was clearly flawed and did not actually represent the needs of our community. The reliance of this report allowed developers planning permission, on green belt land, under the rural exception policy. I understand that analysis of the SHMA that GBC are relying on to demonstrate the need for 1100 house in Normandy has led to very similar findings. Once again it seems clear that this whole proposal is being led by a developer.
The land in question was not identified as a potential development site in the previous local plan. Inclusion in the current plan seems to be wholly developer led. I suspect that councils up and down the country are considering proposals for new schools from developers as it is the latest loophole to be exploited.

Finally I object because we are not talking about a few houses along the road. If you allow this development it will be to destroy all that we love about Normandy. I accept that it would be more convenient to have a shop, or a pub, or even a post office. However, if these things are only possible by creating a town where we once had a lovely village, then I prefer to continue to do without.

Please do not allow this development on our green belt.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1385</th>
<th>Respondent: 15301377 / T and S Padley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

We OBJECT to the GBC Draft Borough Plan regarding Site Allocation 46 (Normandy and Flexford) on the following grounds:

- There is no proven case or exceptional circumstance to justify the need for an additional secondary school within the area:
  - Surrey County Council has already proposed that an urban extension at Blackwell Farm ("....would be a more sustainable location...")
  - Kings College, Ash Manor, Connaught School and Hoe Valley Free School are all undersubscribed
  - The birthrate in Guildford has fallen in the past 2 years.

- The road and transport infrastructure has already reached saturation:
  - Local roads will be unable to sustain the additional traffic that will ensue
    - It is difficult to envisage any highway improvements that would relieve this additional load
    - The potential combination of A3 road improvements and major site work within A46 over the next 15 years would be catastrophic; leading to traffic chaos and population health issues.

- This development-led proposal will cause irreparable damage to the local environment and will place an unacceptable strain on the local infrastructure:
  - It will destroy ancient woodland, trees, hedgerows, farmland and semi-improved grassland and stream
  - Light, noise and litter pollution will increase due to the influx of humans and domestic animals to the area
  - Habitats of protected wildlife species will be damaged and/or destroyed.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3515</th>
<th>Respondent: 15301377 / T and S Padley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Objections to GBC Draft Plan re Normandy and Flexford (Site A46)

We OBJECT to the GBC Draft Borough Plan regarding Site Allocation 46 (Normandy and Flexford) on the following grounds:

- **There is no proven case or exceptional circumstance to justify the need for an additional secondary school within the area:**
  - Surrey County Council has already proposed that an urban extension at Blackwell Farm (“….would be a more sustainable location…”)
  - Kings College, Ash Manor, Connaught School and Hoe Valley Free School are all undersubscribed
  - The birthrate in Guildford has fallen in the past 2 years.

- **The road and transport infrastructure has already reached saturation:**
  - Local roads will be unable to sustain the additional traffic that will ensue
  - It is difficult to envisage any highway improvements that would relieve this additional load
  - The potential combination of A3 road improvements and major site work within A46 over the next 15 years would be catastrophic; leading to traffic chaos and population health issues.

- **This development led proposal will cause irreparable damage to the local environment and will place an unacceptable strain on the local infrastructure:**
  - It will destroy ancient woodland, trees, hedgerows, farmland and semi-improved grassland and stream
  - Light, noise and litter pollution will increase due to the influx of humans and domestic animals to the area
  - Habitats of protected wildlife species will be damaged and/or destroyed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
rates at those junctions would be inevitable. Also the local roads leading to the Lanes are already easily congested so it is extremely likely that traffic chaos would extend well beyond Normandy and Flexford, especially at peak times. This is already demonstrated when there is any kind of restriction on the A31. It only takes a relatively small number of vehicles to divert through Normandy and Flexford from the A31 for Glaziers Lane and Flexford Lane to become gridlocked.

Another issue of major concern is the sewer system and drainage. It is already known that the sewer system can barely cope now. Some residents already experience sewage back flow at times. If a new development of 1100 homes plus a school is linked in the existing system it is difficult to see how it could cope. Improvements would have to be made to the system extending way beyond the boundaries of Normandy and Flexford. Is that actually practicable? I don’t think so. The whole area has a very high water table and during the winter especially localised flooding is common. My property, [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998.], and the neighbouring properties which back on to the proposed development site suffer from significant amounts of laying water in the winter time, a situation that prevails for weeks at a time, not just a few occasional days. Other areas, including the train station car park suffer similar problems. If the fields between Glaziers and Westwood Lanes are built over, given the poor drainage available, the run off from that area could cause even bigger problems. Worse flooding could be the result and, I believe, even subsidence. We already see noticeable surface movement here when the ground becomes waterlogged in the winter.

I do not believe that these issues have even been considered by GBC when proposing this development and would need thorough investigation before any significant development could take place.

The effect on local wildlife cannot be ignored. I believe it would be devastating and unjustifiable. I am sure that there are many others better informed on this than I am and will provide greater detail but I understand that this site is only about 800m from the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area and so is within the 400m – 5km zone of protection.

It seems to me that this proposal is being put forward by Taylor Wimpey purely in the interest of financial gain and without any thought for the existing community and the problems it would cause. GBC have included this proposed large development in the plan along with some other larger sites as it is easier and more convenient for the Council to administer a small number of large sites and developers than a higher number of smaller sites and developers. That is actually by the Council’s own admission. In doing so the Council simply has not properly considered the impact of these sites on the local communities and completely ignored other suitable sites such as the one off the Epsom Road at West Horsley. The promise to provide a new school to justify site A46 will be seen by many, including me, as a rather cynical attempt to push through permission to build on Greenbelt land that would otherwise remain protected and beyond a developer’s grasp. From information that I have received, and I believe it has been drawn to your attention in more detail by others as well, all of the schools in the surrounding area are significantly under subscribed at the moment (including schools in neighbouring boroughs that are willing to accept pupils from surrounding boroughs), with even more school places still to be added. It is, therefore, difficult to see how the provision of another completely new school in Normandy/Flexford is required. Even if such a school was required the Normandy/Flexford site would not be suitable. That in addition to another 1100 homes would have a devastating effect on the area and its residents. In fact both kings Manor and Ash Grange schools have the ability and willingness to expand should there be a demand for more school places in the area. Surely that option would be far more cost effective than building and then having to equip and provide staff for a completely new school in such close proximity. It seems to me the provision of a school on site A46 simply cannot be justified.

I wish to register my strong opposition to the GBC plan and in particular the proposed A46 Normandy/Flexford site. We all appreciate the need to provide more housing and I’m sure most of the residents of Normandy and Flexford are happy to accept a small amount of properly considered, sustainable development in the area but something on the scale that has been proposed simply isn’t sustainable or acceptable. If the development went ahead not only the existing residents would suffer. The new residents would also suffer exactly the same problems.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
With reference to the proposed possible development at the above location I would like to object to this on the following points,

1 The number of properties proposed are far in access for the size of the village which would increase it by 100%. The additional traveller pitches proposed are not necessary as we already have a number of pitches in the bounds of Normandy

2 The development is on green belt land which this Government said they would always protect the green Belt, what has happened to this promise?

3 It is unnecessary to have a new secondary school in this area when the 2 local secondary schools are not fully subscribed. We do not require another village green as we have one already which is more central in the village I feel these two points have been put forward as sweeteners for the Guildford Borough Council.

4 Westwood lane is not a main road and often has heavy traffic during peak times as a through route to the hogs back A31 or the A3, and with the possibility of 600-800 additional vehicles emerging on to Westwood lane trying to get to either of those two main roads would be over and above what the road can cope with. Whichever way the traffic travels there is a rail bridge which is only one way, and we have already had a fatality there where a vehicle hit the bridge and caught fire. Or if they try to merge on to the A323, the site lines are very restricted especially if you are turning right to Guildford.

5 The station car park is not capable of taking more cars and there is no room for increasing the size, which would mean that there would be cars parking in the surrounding roads. Glaziers lane is a lorry route and therefore additional cars parked in the road would also be a problem

6 This development would disrupt the infrastructure of the village and the destruction of our rural environment.

I would ask the planning committee to think hard about this development. And I wish to strongly object to the proposal.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
May I add one final thought for consideration. A 4000 house development is already under way in the Aldershot area. There will obviously be developments in Guildford and Waverley. If we add up all the new housing numbers which have been quoted do they not already far exceed the number requested by government. I have a belief that they do which points to one simple fact - 1100 new houses are not needed in Normandy so let us leave the village and its surrounding landscape as a natural "green belt" buffer zone between the invading urban sprawl to east and west.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1634  Respondent: 15342305 / Redmond Neale  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the development of Normandy/ Flexford and the potential development of 1,100 homes.

My thoughts are as follows:

I have lived in Normandy for all my life (now I'm 25 years old) I have up till now been living with my parents. But I am now moving out and will be buying a house within the lovely quiet countryside village of Normandy. I have always aspired to buy my first home here.

BUT now I have seen Guildford Borough's plans and I am deeply saddened and worried. Makes me want to move out of the village to be honest! As if building on the green belt is not bad enough they are proposing to completely change and definitely ruin our village! We don't want the extra housing or infrastructure here. We live in a small countryside village and that's why everyone moved here. People compliment the area saying 'it's so quiet round here' or say 'the countryside is lovely' not 'glad we got that housing estate to meet the councils targets'. Maybe Guildford Borough Council can give people all their money back on their properties in Normandy? Because most of the properties round Normandy were sold to people under the description of 'set in a small countryside village' and now they want to change that?!

From growing up and spending quite a few weekends of my life on the land they propose to build on I can confirm a lot of wildlife/ beautiful scenery would be lost. And how exactly would the Grade 2 listed Queen Ann house be suited to be directly opposite 1,100 houses? Also Parwood Equestrian Centre? Next to a housing estate? Makes me laugh in a way as the proposal is so out of place. The council are acting with no due care and attention. I feel Normandy is an easy target for them as quite a few elderly people live there and they are bound to not be able to kick up as bigger fuss as say a proposal in Tongham where younger couples live and where there is a higher concentration of people.

Normandy's green belt should be protected, and if anything the site should be turned into a nature reserve!

I am really angry at Guildford Borough council to be honest. They spend all this money putting up signs in the village about the Surrey hills and say how it's an area of natural beauty then they want to create a concrete jungle not even a mile down the road! I think I could come up with about 10 better sites for this development and I'm not even employed by them.

- Flexford was once called Flaxford, itself a corruption of "flax yard", meaning flax meadows by a stream. Through the proposed development you would completely remove what the area once stood for. Do you really propose to remove the meadows from Flexford?

- I am personally unable to see a demand for a secondary school, a lot of the children around the area go to Ash Manor which is a mile or so down the road or travel into town on the train or get the school bus which comes around the houses. Maybe we should expand the existing schools to cope with the extra demand? You do not live in the countryside and...
expect to have a Secondary School next door to you. Furthermore Ash Manor and Guildford County are UNDER SUBSCRIBED!

- The development is just too close to an Area of Natural Beauty. You should not build right up to the edges of this area just because you can.

- The development really does not fit in with the local area. One property that comes to mind is the listed Queen Ann House on the same road you propose this development. To me this would ruin the history behind this wonderful property.

- You just can't double the size of a small village such as Normandy, it's not morally right or fair on the people who current live in the village. Even if you drastically reduce the number of homes you are still doubling the size of this small community.

- Building on the land would mean getting rid of a lot of precious rare wildlife and ancient woodland and this in itself would be horrible to see.

- You would be essentially de valuing a lot of the properties that are nearby the proposed development. No one wants their back garden backing onto a housing estate.

- You would be "Turning Rural pasture into a urban ghetto"

- People moved to Normandy to live in a quiet countryside village, not the concrete jungle the council propose. You can not change the entire characteristics of a small village just to meet government demands.

- I know for a fact every single resident when asked about the development and if they would favour it on the basis it would bring a pub or shop, would certainly say they would rather not have a shop or pub if it means saying goodbye to the greenbelt. To base a supporting argument on the fact it will bring more facilities is rubbish to me. Like most normal people I travel to a supermarket in the car each week or take a short bus ride to a shop down the road. Most people in Normandy are over 65 so this is free for them!

- We already have a pub but it's disused and currently empty - through not enough customers. It is not right to increase the population in the village just to bring in the facilities.

- This proposal is no different to Wisley Airfield proposal that was denied.

- I feel the council should not be wasting precious time on a proposal like this.

- A secondary school in Normandy would to me be extremely out of place, its not suited to a countryside location.

- Traffic is already bad enough on the Aldershot Road - It is an absolute nightmare every evening/ morning especially by where you propose the development. The traffic will often queue all the way to Ash Station from Wyke Church. There is also no way to relieve this with a new road structure.

- I also note the proposal has an affordable housing element. Normandy is not about affordable housing, you aspire to live here. Put it this way I'm 25 and personally feel the housing on offer to young people in Guildford is adequate. Affordable housing in Normandy is like building flats on the Wentworth Estate.

- Normandy is a quiet country village and you should not be allowed to change that. It's been like that for thousands of years. I know the population is growing but we simply can NOT ruin Villages like Normandy for future generations.

- The proposed development would seriously harm the openness of the Greenbelt in the Area.

- In my eyes you need to develop out the towns or develop existing Brownfield sites. You just can't put such a huge development on a tiny historic village such as Normandy/ Flexford. We should preserve our history.
I do hope you re consider this planned development and take my thoughts into consideration. I don't want to raise my future children in what the council propose and pray for them to be able to experience what has made Normandy so special to me.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1783</th>
<th>Respondent: 15348545 / Ronald Kitchen</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong>  ( ), is Sound?  ( ), is Legally Compliant?  ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am writing to voice my objections to the draft local plan for the site in Normandy. I am retired and I therefore do not have to travel at peak times but the traffic on our local route and make getting around our local area extremely difficult. Today for example we had rain causing the drain at the top of Wanborough Hill to overflow this had the effect of nose to tail traffic tailing back on Westwood Lane, with the new development in place the numbers of cars on our lanes will be greatly increased.

I further object on the grounds that we do not require another school in this area as we already have schools which are accessible to the pupils in this area with capacity to accept them. If this school is built for the complete school curriculum years these pupils will need to come from outside the Normandy area putting very high stresses on the transport and road system.

I also would draw your attention to the wildlife that is currently residing alongside the occupants of Normandy, doubling the size of our village will lead to the decline of any wildlife in the immediate area. We are also adjacent to the Thames basin and although this is a conservation area this vast influx of people will have a detrimental affect on the environment.

I object as also there are no provisions to increase the capacity of either our doctors or the local hospital and this will have very serious consequences on our health provision.

Our roads or paths cannot cope now and with no assisted road crossings on any of the raids will result in a tradegy.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1847</th>
<th>Respondent: 15350817 / Brian Oliver</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong>  ( ), is Sound?  ( ), is Legally Compliant?  ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the plan which relates to the site A46 and which would have effect of removing this site from greenbelt. It is common knowledge that only " very special circumstances" can ever justify such action.
We read that it was recently conceded as a result of an amendment put forward by Councillor David Bilbe that the only possible candidate for consideration as a very special need would be a proven requirement to build a new secondary school in Normandy. If it should be shown that such a building is not a requirement, the proposal as a whole should fail.

Local Councillor Keith Witham ascertained from personal discussions with appropriate head teachers that, on the contrary, there were many unfilled vacancies. Most schools in the area are under-subscribed and this adds up to a total of over 700 places. Furthermore, when in two years’ time the planned new vacancies at the new ‘financial College’ are added in, the total of over 1,000 vacancies will provide ample future provision. Any new secondary school in Normandy would clearly be superfluous. The cost and all the traffic overload at school term times would be unacceptable burdens with no compensatory elements.

The proposal to fill the area between Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane with buildings would have the effect all by itself of turning Normandy village, a place of some character with beautiful views across the surrounding greenbelt area and which includes a splendid natural pond with a wide range of wildlife, into just another small town. It would be hardly exaggerating to state that that would blight the majority of Normandy people's lives. All the extra traffic would also add to problems with low-lying land and some flooding problems. (A cracked drain in Glaziers Lane has been acknowledged to have been caused by heavy traffic).

Traffic driving down from The Hog’s Back into Normandy along Westwood Lane and often forking via Glaziers Lane and so merging with heavy traffic both westwards from Guildford and eastwards from Aldershot already causes constant hold-ups as well as damage to the road surfaces. The proposals would bring conditions to breaking point especially as Rushmore’s imminent expansion by thousands of new homes will further to overload these routes.

I should expect further genuine attention being given to permitting more small developments on brown-field sites rather than attempting to build on the greenbelt areas in this heedless way.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
flooding and in the winter will push walkers and others on to Ash Ranges which has SSSI status, and the increase in users can only have a detrimental effect on vegetation and wildlife.

I object to the nature of the development and feel it should be in keeping with the existing housing.

I feel strongly that the burden of new homes should be spread more evenly throughout the UK and not heavily in southeast and not in large developments, however lucrative and convenient for builders.

Lastly and not least the vote to leave the EU has sent a clear message that the country does not want mass immigration, thus putting the whole need for such a review in doubt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1964  Respondent: 15357537 / Alison Dunn  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing TO OBJECT to this proposal most strongly. There are so many reasons why this is totally inappropriate and a very bad decision, I will try and summarise my objections as follows:

- This proposal was added to the plan at the last minute it seems, and it is not properly thought through as I will demonstrate below – it comes across as suiting the wishes of the development company to make huge profits at the expense of the local community, and suiting GBC who would complete a large part of their obligations with one single development – again at the expense of the existing community and village
- It is totally reckless to destroy a village and local community with such a large disproportionate development – I totally understand the need for new housing and would welcome a smaller development – were this to be distributed across GBC fairly and proportionately
- GBC have not demonstrated the exceptional circumstances required to justify the release of this land – red sensitivity - from the Green Belt – no school is needed and if it were it does not have to be built on the Green Belt. Rokers are offering the potential for a school and development in a far more accessible area with better roads.
- A school is not needed in this area – there are very few children in the village, and a number of schools in the area which are currently undersubscribed – and were this situation to change could easily expand to take in further pupils which would be far less costly than building a new school from scratch. It seems that the need for a school has been invented to provide a convenient reason to destroy a large part of the green belt – which this present council during last year’s elections vowed to protect -what hypocrisy.
- So the school justifies the housing estate which justifies the school ……….. you are creating the need which didn’t exist previously……. Unfair on the local community, great for the developers and their pockets
- Our roads are already congested at peak times, and whenever anything goes wrong on other local roads, and busy the rest of the time. Adding in the traffic that would come with a further 1100 houses would bring the area to a standstill. I can’t see how there is any capacity to develop Westwood Lane or Glaziers Lane or Wanborough Hill – all country lanes which already struggle with the amount of cars on the road through the village – given the restrictions of existing houses and the railway bridges. The A323 similarly gets extremely congested. While there is a station, the reality is that most people use cars to travel locally. South West trains are notoriously unreliable. An additional 1000 to 2000 cars on the road daily will bring us to a complete halt.
- It is already difficult to get a fast appointment at the doctors surgery – I can’t see that there would be capacity for this many further people.
- The impact on local wildlife would be devastating – why not look at brownfield sites – surely the green belt should only be looked at when there are no further brownfield sites available, and then in a proportionate manner?
• Concreting over so much land would be likely to worsen the flood risk in the area
• Our drainage systems are already very poor. We have called out Thames Water around ten times recently, as we
  are constantly getting sewage come up in our garden. What would be the impact of so many new homes on the
  current drainage system?
• There would be an adverse impact on the health and wellbeing of existing local residents – our needs are being
callously swept aside – for profit and convenience

There has to be a better way, proportionate and reasonable development across the whole borough, focussing on
brownfield sites and existing school resources. Please drop the proposal for A46 immediately.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2609  Respondent: 15358817 / Lin Rose  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

I wish to express my objections to the Guildford Borough Local Plans for the following reasons:

• I consider that the overall plan indicates considerable overdevelopment for the Normandy and Flexford areas,
  which will destroy the openness and rural environment, which currently
• I object to the proposed development of a minimum of 1200 houses within the boundaries of Strategic Site A46,
  which is all within Green Belt
• Building on Green belt land can only be considered if it can be shown that there are very special GBC have not
demonstrated any special circumstances within the Local Plan as to why it is necessary to remove this land from
the protection of the Green Belt, is therefore against National Policy for the Protection of the Green Belt, and
strongly object to the proposals. The intended purpose of the Green Belt is to maintain areas of green fields and
natural beauty of the green fields, which will be destroyed if Site A46 is allowed to be developed.
• The proposed development is within sight of the Hogs Back and the Surrey Hills which are allocated as Areas of
outstanding Natural Beauty and as such would be detrimental to the openness and beauty of this area.

• There are many brown field sites that exist within the GBC area, which could be used to meet the housing needs,
but the Local Plan does not demonstrate that these sites will be used to meet the demand of future housing
• Whilst may accept more houses are needed, if this site and is approved for development of 1200 homes,
Normandy would increase by 60 to 70% and would create one large urban sprawl, almost joining up with the
additional developments approved within Ash and Tongham. The proposed allocation of houses in Normandy is
very disproportional compared to many of the other villages and parishes within the Guildford Borough. The
proposed demand for additional housing contained within the Local Plan should be spread evenly amongst all
the villages and parishes within the Guildford Borough area.

• Infrastructure:

Traffic: There are no proposals to improve the existing road systems and footpaths within Normandy and the
developments would increase traffic and congestion, not only from transportation of building materials over many years
but also the resulting additional housing.

In Normandy, the A323 suffers with congestion with the main junctions at Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane, as does
the A324 at its junction with the A323 at Elm Hill. In particular Glaziers Lane has no continuous footpath from one end
to the other and pedestrians have to cross the road twice where there is a humped back railway bridge and a blind bend.
Similarly, there is a narrow railway bridge situated in Westwood Lane, which has a Priority One Way system for vehicles, and co-joining with a blind road junction with Beech Lane. The increase of traffic volumes with this proposed development and the proposed new Secondary School would be dangerous to pedestrians and traffic and cause unacceptable congestion.

- Flooding: Flooding frequently occurs due to inadequate surface water drainage and also from the sewer. Both of the system have insufficient capacity for the existing houses and would need to be significantly enlarged to prevent future flooding.
- Utilities: The existing overhead Electricity supply would also need to be modernized as it frequently cuts off whenever there is high winds or heavy downfalls of
- Shops: Although the proposed development within the area of Site A46 contains provision for shops there is no guarantee that there will be General Grocery shops, within the development to supply the household requirements of food and other domestic supplies. Without these assurances that these types of shops will be provided within the site there would be a significant increase in road traffic on the existing minor roads of Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane.
- Primary School/Nurseries: Wyke School does not have the capacity to absorb the potential increase of children from the significant increase in family homes necessitating major additional building work to increase the number of classrooms.

In conclusion, within the Local Plan documentation, Normandy appears to have been identified to take significantly more proposed housing development than many of the other larger Wards within the Guildford Borough Council Planning jurisdiction.

Other Wards appear to have the same or better, transport and community services but Normandy appears to have been singled out to take proportionally more additional housing within the Green Belt.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2591  
**Respondent:** 15358945 / Ian Rose  
**Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I am writing to register my objections to the very large number of proposed houses and housing developments within the above Parish Council area at Strategic Site A46 for the following reasons:

1. **Green Belt:**

   The intention and importance of the Green Belt is to ensure that the hamlets and villages within it are separated by openness and are not conjoined by large scale housing developments such as those proposed adjoining the west side of Glaziers Lane and the east side of Westwood Lane.

   The proposed Local Plan will double the number of homes in the centre of rural Normandy which is designated as Green Belt. Previously Planning Inspectors have declined previous applications and consider that the green fields contribute to the openness of the Green Belt with views to the Surrey Hills AONB.

   In June 2015 the Conservative Government and the Prime Minister in their election manifesto said 'we will always protect the Green Belt and make sure planning decisions are made by local people' and only in exceptional circumstances when there are no other options would the Green Belt be allowed to be built on.
1. Destruction of rural environment:

I strongly object to the proposed development of an additional 1,100 houses within the Green Belt and is currently prime pasture/agricultural land.

The Green Belt is in place to check unrestricted sprawl of built up areas which will occur with the number of proposed houses in Tongham and Ash, leaving only a small strip of open land between them and Normandy preventing them from joining up.

It is also to safeguard the countryside from the encroachment of building development. With regard to the proposed Local Plan document these principles appear to have been completely disregarded.

1. Infrastructure:

The existing roads flanking both the east and west side of the proposed site for the 1,100 houses are classified as minor 'C' class roads and will not be able to cope with the increase in additional traffic generated by this large development. At present Glaziers Lane (C60) does not have a continuous footpath on any one side of the road from its junction with Flexford Road and the A323 Aldershot Road and pedestrians have to cross the road twice at two very dangerous points on this busy road.

One is the north side of the humped back railway bridge at Wanborough Station and the other one is between Numbers 38 to 43. If the proposed number of houses are built with resulting large increase in traffic there would be a need to have footpaths constructed over the length of Glaziers Lane in the interests of road safety to pedestrians.

Westwood Lane crosses underneath the railway line and is insufficiently wide for 2 way traffic flow (priority to traffic going north to south) which, at busy commuter times, traffic will build up either side of the railway bridge at this point.

The A323 Guildford. Road at commuter times frequently build up through Normandy at present due to the increase in large developments of houses within the ash parish and Rushmoor area.

The increase of traffic travelling up Wanborough Hill /Westwood Lane (C16) to join the A31 will severely increase the queues of traffic travelling east to Guildford or west to Farnham and also the B3006, Puttenham Heath Road to join the A3. These roads are already gridlocked at peak times now without the additional traffic generated by the proposed development.

4) Justification of Second School:

You have suggested that the need for a Secondary School is sufficient 'exceptional circumstance' to justify to build on the Green Belt but GBC have not proven that there is sufficient demand for a new school with regard to existing pupils.

The proposed 1,100 homes appears to be a Developer led development.

The proposed Secondary School land and building being offered by them at nil cost could allegedly be conceived to be an inducement (or bribe) to obtain support from Guildford Borough Council and Surrey County Council to obtain Planning Permission for such a large development on Green Belt land.

The Secondary School, if approved, will generate even more additional traffic and the existing traffic queues at peak times will exacerbate the traffic problems at the start and end of school hours.

The area in Glaziers Lane (C60) where the Hoe stream crosses underneath the road between Numbers 68 and 76 on the west side and Numbers 38 and 43 on the east side is subject to flooding and is designated as an area liable to flooding on the Environmental Agency maps. The flooding occurs when there is heavy continuous rainfall and can occur summer or winter. The two main causes of this flash flooding is the rainwater runoff from houses and driveways with drains connected the main sewer. This causes the 150mm main sewer running south to north to surcharge causing the road and surrounding land and gardens to flood. As the 150mm connects into a 225mm main sewer between Numbers 38 and 48 which is also of insufficient capacity the sewer also surcharges at this point causing additional flooding.
Thames Water is well aware of this flooding problems and there would need to be major increase in sewer capacity if any of the proposed housing developments take place.

The proposed new developments would detrimentally increase the risk of flooding the above mentioned location causing great distress to the residents currently living there.

5. Shops and other Commercial development

These will again generate more traffic on the minor and major roads in the area.

1. Wyke Junior School:

Wyke School does not have the capacity to absorb the potential increase of children from the significant increase in family homes necessitating major additional building work to increase the number of classrooms required.

In conclusion, within the Local Plan documentation, Normandy appears to have been identified to take significantly more proposed housing development than many of the other larger Wards within the Guildford Borough Council Planning jurisdiction.

Other Wards appear to have the same or better, transport and community services but Normandy appears to have been singled out to take proportionally more additional housing within the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2157  Respondent: 15369185 / Keith, S. Jane and Natasha Liddell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Summary

Since delivery of the 2014 Draft Local Plan, a new strategic site (designated A46) has been created between Normandy and Flexford in a Green Belt area of high sensitivity (a red area) and brought forward for development within proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites ("the draft Local Plan") covering the period to 2033; this site having previously been safeguarded for future development in the 2014 Draft Local Plan. This change from "Safeguarding" to "strategic site for development" has been done without any further consultation and is included in the draft Local Plan with in a rushed manner, with minimal justification and virtually no objective infrastructure planning and costing.

At a meeting of Guildford Borough Council held on 24 May 2016 the Council resolved inter alia:

(1) That the draft Local Plan: strategy and sites document, as submitted to the Council, be approved for formal public consultation for a period of six weeks beginning 6 June 2016, subject to the following proviso:

As strategic site allocation A46, Land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford, is a land parcel coloured red on the Green Belt sensitivity map and is only included as a strategic site to support the provision of a new secondary school, this strategic site allocation be deleted should it be demonstrated that provision of such a school within this site is not required.
The document *Guildford Draft Local Plan: Education Review, May 2016* ("LP:ER") is contained within the draft Local Plan, and suggests the provision of an 8FE secondary school at site A46 (SED3 of the draft Local Plan Part 3:Appendix C “SED3’’). This proposed secondary school is contained within site A46 conceptual plans submitted to GBC by the aspirant developer Taylor Wimpey plc as part of their response to the 2014 Draft Local Plan. The LP:ER also proposed two other new secondary schools in other locations within the Borough totalling a further 8FE.

The LP:ER calls for only 5FE new secondary places required within the Borough above “that already planned” in the period to 2025 as a result of new dwellings to be built to then. It also states “beyond 2025 there is likely to be a further need for secondary places – potentially up to a further 5FE”.

2. Our Objection and Submission

We object to the inclusion of site A46 in the Local Plan.

We submit that the requirement for provision of a new secondary school within site A46 is not demonstrated in the draft Local Plan and its accompanying evidence base and therefore the allocation of site A46 should be deleted from the Local Plan in accordance with the proviso attached to Resolution 1 of the 24 May 2016 GBC meeting.

In fact, the evidence base in the draft Local Plan shows that a secondary school at Site A46 is NOT required.

3. QUESTION 1 – The Evidence Base and Submission Documents.

We do not agree that the evidence used for the Proposed Submission Local Plan Strategy and Sites, as it relates to site A46 and the need for a new secondary school at that site, is adequate, up-to-date and relevant.

Our reasoning, using the Evidence Base, is given as follows.

3.1 Provision of Education in Surrey

The responsibility for provision of Education in Surrey lies with Surrey County Council, not GBC. SCC annually produces a report, the latest being the *Schools Organisation Plan December 2015* (“SOP”). The SOP has a 10 year outlook, and does not call for a new secondary school requirement within this timeframe; therefore SCC in the SOP, as informed by the 2014 draft Local Plan and its inherent new housing plan, is not calling for building of a new secondary school in Guildford Borough in the period to 2025.

In terms of school sustainability and operating efficiency, SCC states that schools have to operate full or nearly (95%) full, and that any schools with more that 25% surplus places will be viewed by SCC as educationally and financially unsustainable; where possible SCC seeks to take action early to ensure that schools do not reach this point of unsustainability. Furthermore, SCC prefers to see existing schools expand rather than develop new schools, since this is a more efficient and sustainable use of infrastructural, economic and human capital.

Also, SCC state that, to be sustainable, a new secondary school has to have a minimum of 6FE. The two other new secondary schools at strategic sites Wisley and Gosden Hill are proposed in the LP:ER to be 4FE, which would be below the SCC threshold of sustainability, since both of these schools are in areas of higher population density and are sustainable strategic sites it is evident that these schools should be increased in size to 6FE each, should it not be proven that existing schools cannot be expanded to meet any future needs.

3.2 Proposed development does not require an 8FE secondary school

The proposed development of 1,100 dwellings on site A46 would result in a secondary school requirement of one Form of Entry (30 places) (Source LP:ER). Therefore the proposed A46 development does not, in itself, require provision of an 8FE secondary school at the site.

3.3 Proposed new secondary school at Site A46 is in wrong location

Site A46 in the Normandy ward is located in a sparsely populated area of the borough (Refer to the housing density map contained in the LP:ER, below), therefore is situated remotely from potential pupils, causing unsustainable travel
requirements to fill the school places sufficiently to achieve and maintain school sustainability required by SCC. The justification for the school made in SED3 is that it serves the surrounding area, however the on the Evidence Base contained in the draft Local Plan, Normandy and the surrounding area does not need a secondary school.

[IMAGE 1]

3.4 Local Plan itself shows a secondary school is not needed at A46

According to the LP:ER, Site A46 is located in a ward that does not need additional education provision at all during the life of the Draft Plan, and is immediately adjacent to wards that either also do not need additional education provision over the life of the plan, or are only affected in the first 5 years of the plan i.e. before a secondary school could be built. Area 46 is distant from the wards that are affected over the whole life of plan (refer to map below reproduced from the LP:ER). Therefore location of a secondary school at A46 is unsustainable according to both SCC and GBC principles.

Pupils in Ash South and Tongham and Ash Vale also avail themselves of Secondary Schools in Hampshire (Farnham and Aldershot) further reducing need for a new secondary school in Normandy.

[IMAGE 2]

3.5 Declining birth rate in Guildford

The birth rate in Guildford is declining, reducing the future need for school places.

[IMAGE 3]

3.6 Existing secondary school capacity exists

Representations have been made by the head teachers of various Secondary Schools to the 2014 Draft Plan and to GBC and SCC, stating that they have existing capacity to take new pupils, and that they also have space and infrastructure to permanently expand. This is in accordance with SCC’s school sustainability policy of using under-utilised existing capacity and of expanding existing schools in preference to developing new schools.

3.7 Migration to UK to decline

Following the Brexit vote, government and commentators agree that migration into the UK will decline significantly once the UK exits the EU. This will naturally reduce the demand for housing and education within Guildford Borough, further negating the justification for a new Secondary School at site A46 at Normandy/Flexford.

3.8 A new secondary school at site A46 is unsustainable.

A new secondary school at Normandy is not sustainable on many levels, some being:

- It is not demonstrated that there will be sufficient pupils from the surrounding area to maintain 95% capacity.
- The site is in a sparsely populated area of the B
- The Local Plan shows that Normandy is a ward that does not need additional secondary school provision over the life of the PI
- If any extra secondary provision is needed, it is to the east or north, not west of the borough.
- Road transport infrastructure to the site has limited capacity without major changes to infrastructure.
- The site destroys greenbelt, ancient woodland, vulnerable habitats, impinges on listed buildings and is located is on an area of important drainage for flood mitigation.
- Heavy clay soils will give rise to unusable playing and sports fields.

We note that the Sustainability Appraisal of the Guildford Borough Local Plan, June 2016 (“SA”) does not deal with education sustainability nor considers the sustainability of transport and infrastructure requirements arising from education needs arising from the draft Local Plan. In respect of education, the SA merely makes some high level, self-serving and unsubstantiated comments with regard to spatial strategy.
1. Summary

Since delivery of the 2014 Draft Local Plan, a new strategic site (designated A46) has been created between Normandy and Flexford in a Green Belt area of high sensitivity (a red area) and brought forward for development within proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites (“the draft Local Plan”) covering the period to 2033; this site having previously been safeguarded for future development in the 2014 Draft Local Plan. This change from “Safeguarding” to “strategic site for development” has been done without any further consultation and is included in the draft Local Plan with in a rushed manner, with minimal justification and virtually no objective infrastructure planning and costing.

At a meeting of Guildford Borough Council held on 24 May 2016 the Council resolved inter alia:

(1) That the draft Local Plan: strategy and sites document, as submitted to the Council, be approved for formal public consultation for a period of six weeks beginning 6 June 2016, subject to the following proviso:

As strategic site allocation A46, Land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford, is a land parcel coloured red on the Green Belt sensitivity map and is only included as a strategic site to support the provision of a new secondary school, this strategic site allocation be deleted should it be demonstrated that provision of such a school within this site is not required.

The document Guildford Draft Local Plan: Education Review, May 2016, (“LP:ER”) is contained within the draft Local Plan, and suggests the provision of an 8FE secondary school at site A46 (SED3 of the draft Local Plan Part 3: Appendix C “SED3”). This proposed secondary school is contained within site A46 conceptual plans submitted to GBC by the aspirant developer Taylor Wimpey plc as part of their response to the 2014 Draft Local Plan. The LP:ER also proposed two other new secondary schools in other locations within the Borough totalling a further 8FE.

The LP:ER calls for only 5FE new secondary places required within the Borough above “that already planned” in the period to 2025 as a result of new dwellings to be built to then. It also states “beyond 2025 there is likely to be a further need for secondary places – potentially up to a further 5FE”.

2. Our Objection and Submission

We object to the inclusion of site A46 in the Local Plan.

We submit that the requirement for provision of a new secondary school within site A46 is not demonstrated in the draft Local Plan and its accompanying evidence base and therefore the allocation of site A46 should be deleted from the Local Plan in accordance with the proviso attached to Resolution 1 of the 24 May 2016 GBC meeting.

In fact, the evidence base in the draft Local Plan shows that a secondary school at Site A46 is NOT required.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
The Friends of Normandy Wildlife (FNW) strongly object to the proposed development (sites A46 and A47) in Normandy and Flexford as set out in the Guildford Borough Council Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites, June 2016 (the Plan). Our Response comprises the following:

Background: The importance of Normandy and Flexford for biodiversity, nature conservation and wildlife.


Section 2: Conflict of the Plan with relevant national and local policies on biodiversity and the natural environment.

Section 3: Deleterious effects of proposed development (Policies A46 and A47) on biodiversity, the natural environment and associated wildlife.

Section 4: Objection to proposal to inset Normandy and Flexford from the Green Belt.

Section 5: Concluding comments.

There are a number of nationally important sites for nature conservation within and adjoining the Parish of Normandy.

(i) Statutory Designated Sites

Normandy Parish includes a large part of Ash Ranges which form part of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA; see Map 1, Appendix 1), a statutory designated site and designated for its rare and vulnerable birds, specifically nightjar, Dartford warbler and woodlark, under the EC Birds Directive. This site also forms part of the Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham Special Area of Conservation (SAC), a statutory designated site and designated for its North Atlantic wet heaths, European dry heaths and peat bogs.

Ash Ranges also form part of the Ash to Brookwood Heaths Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), a statutory designated site and designated for its dry heathland, wet heathland and bog, bryophytes (mosses and lichens), invertebrates (such as the scarce bog bush cricket), birds (such as hobby, stonechat, yellowhammer, reed bunting, tree pipit, meadow pipit and the previously mentioned SPA bird species), and reptiles (all six native species including the European Protected Species sand lizard and smooth snake).

(ii) Non-Statutory Designated Sites

Within a radius of 2 km from site A47 there are eight non-statutory designated sites (see Map 2, Appendix 1). These sites are known as Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCIs) and are identified on account of the habitats and flora/fauna they support. They are of County or regional wildlife importance.

(III) Ancient Woodland

Ancient woodland is defined by Natural England as a site that has had a continuous woodland cover since at least 1600 AD. It is an irreplaceable, wildlife-rich habitat known to support more biodiversity than any other UK land habitat, and often includes important archaeological features.
The proposed development site contains several areas of ancient woodland (see Map 3, Appendix 1). The two main areas in or bordering site A46 in the Plan are Pussey's and Walden's Copses. In addition, there are two smaller areas, the offset East-West trending belt of woodland West of Pussey's Copse and the smaller North-South trending belt south of Walden's Copse. This woodland is clearly ancient (as identified from associated flora such as primroses, bluebells, wood anemones and early purple orchids), but is not included in the Ancient Woodland Inventory because it is slightly under the minimum registration size of two hectares. Nevertheless, we believe that this valuable and irreplaceable woodland should be treated as if it was protected and therefore be left intact. The current developer plan shows a road bisecting this woodland; if implemented it would destroy a precious green corridor.

There is an avenue of old oaks towards the centre of the footpath that crosses the site, which are registered on the Ancient Tree Inventory, and other individual trees on the site which the Woodland Trust regards as valuable in terms of conservation.

- Other Habitats of Importance

There are a number of other habitats of importance within the Parish which are important to biodiversity and enhance the natural beauty of the area.

- Hedgerows

Hedgerows surround many of the fields within the Parish. These are important habitats for nesting and foraging birds, small mammals including dormice, amphibians and reptiles, and many invertebrates and plants. They also function as green corridors for wildlife.

- Traditional Orchards

Traditional orchards (see Appendix 2) are also present within the Parish which are all Priority Habitats. The Normandy Traditional Community Orchard is home to a number of species and some of these are Notable Rare or Scarce species.

- Ponds and Streams

A number of important wetland habitats are located within the Parish. Two of these ponds (Normandy Pond and Little Flexford Flax Pond) have been designated as Sites of Nature Conservation Importance. The Flax Pond and stream at Little Flexford have records of water voles (UK's fastest declining mammal species), and the Flax Pond has anecdotal records of great crested newts (European Protected Species).

The stream and Normandy Pond on Normandy Common have records of water voles and Normandy Pond in particular has records of several dragonfly species. There are anecdotal records of great crested newts present on Normandy Common, particularly in the wooded areas near to Normandy Pond.

Some large ponds also occur in the region of Little Flexford. These are home to many species of waterfowl, as well as providing breeding sites for common frogs and toads and foraging sites for grass snakes.

- Fauna and flora present on land between Normandy and Flexford (re Policy A46)

The investigations of the proposed site by FNW were unfortunately limited since our only permitted access was the footpath across the site. Despite this restriction, we have been able to show that the area is rich in species, especially bird species. Had we had greater access and a more prolonged time period over which to monitor the area, we are confident that, given the nature of the habitats, many more species would have been identified.

- Birds

Birds offer our best guide to the presence of species of conservation concern because they can be heard from a distance and they are likely to be seen flying around the general area. Site A46 falls within 4 one kilometre grid squares (SU9250, SU9350, SU9251 and SU9351) which combine to form a tetrad. From our group's records and those of BirdTrack (a collaborative online recording package from the British Trust for Ornithology, RSPB and Birdwatch Ireland) we find that 15 Red listed birds, have been recorded from the A46 tetrad. A full listing can be seen in Appendix 3. Additional birds
such as lapwing, feldfare, grey wagtail, marsh tit and lesser-spotted woodpecker, which are likely to be present given the nature of the habitats, would increase this figure to twenty. In addition, another 18 species occurring on the Amber list (BoCC4) have been recorded from the tetrad. BoCC4, has been compiled by the UK's leading bird conservation organisations and they state that there are more birds on the Red List that occur in woodland (e.g. woodcock, nightingale) than in any other habitat and that farmland birds (e.g. lapwing, grey partridge, redwing, fieldfare, skylark) are still a major concern. The woodland and agricultural land in Normandy Parish therefore provides a key area for endangered species.

- **Amphibians**

  Amphibians are considered to act as good barometers of the overall health of the environment and are protected species. All of the UK amphibian species have been recorded (based on the Surrey Amphibian and Reptile Group (SARG) Interactive Atlas) in the A46 tetrad with the exception of the most threatened and European protected species, natterjack toad and great crested newt. However, the latter species has been recorded in the tetrads to the South and East and so could be present.

- **Reptiles**

  All UK species of reptiles except for the rare smooth snake and sand lizard have been recorded in the A46 Tetrad (SARG Interactive Atlas).

- **Hazel dormice (dormice) and water vole**

  Dormice and water voles are considered by FNW to be potentially present in the area. A local person living near the A46 site has reportedly seen the fully protected dormice using a box in their garden and, since these animals are known to occupy ancient woodland more frequently than recent woodland, we feel that there is every chance they are present on site A46, but as stated above, our investigations have been limited.

  According to Surrey Wildlife Trust water voles have suffered one of the most catastrophic declines of any British mammal and, as mentioned above, have been recorded at Little Flexford in the past. Since their home territories extend linearly along the banks of streams, there is still a possibility that a population exists undetected on private land in upstream or downstream locations, or even on tributaries on site A46. It is imperative that their habitat is reained and not disturbed.

- **Other sensitive species**

  A sensitive species seen in the A46 tetrad is the white admiral butterfly a (UK Biodiversity Action Plan [BAP] priority species). This occurs in woodland areas and along with the purple emperor (Butterfly Conservation 2010 Red list: near-threatened) is likely to be found in site A46. The seriously threatened stag beetle (a BAP priority species and protected in the UK) is a Normandy speciality and has been seen recently in Glaziers Lane and the Guildford Road (North of site A46) amongst other areas.

  - **More common species**

    Pipistrelle bats are relatively common, as are roe deer. There are many of the common species of birds, for example, blue tit, great tit and magpie; butterflies such as orange tip, brimstone, red admiral and peacock; and plants including meadow vetchling, red clover, white clover, early purple orchid and wood sorrel.

    One of the most influential figures in nature conservation, Sir Norman Winfrid Moore, stated "It cannot be said too often that it is as much a conservationist’s job to keep common species common as it is to ensure the survival of rare species". We fully endorse this statement and believe it should be applied throughout Normandy and Flexford.
2. Conflict of the Plan with relevant national and local policies on biodiversity and the natural environment

The national and local policies on biodiversity and the natural environment listed below all make strong statements about the need to minimise the impact of development on biodiversity and to conserve the natural environment.

It is clear that the proposals for development in Normandy and Flexford directly conflict with these policies and we object to these development proposals as GBC have failed to show how they will conserve and enhance biodiversity.

2.1 The National Planning Policy Framework

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that "The purpose of planning is to help to achieve sustainable development" and it describes three "dimensions" relevant to this aim: economic, social and environmental. The explanation for how the environmental aspect plays a role includes the statement ".....helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently ...." (see point 7 of the section in the NPPF dealing with achieving sustainable development).

In section 11 headed "Conserving and enhancing the natural environment", it is stated inter alia that planning policy should protect and enhance valued landscapes and minimise impacts on biodiversity, providing net gains in biodiversity wherever possible to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, by promoting "the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations .....".

2.2 Guildford Borough Council

Guildford Borough Council (GBC) interprets the NPPF through their 'Policy 14' which emphasises the commitment to biodiversity stating: "The Council will conserve and enhance biodiversity and will seek opportunities for habitat restoration and creation, particularly within and adjacent to Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs)"

Proposals for development must demonstrate how they will deliver appropriate net gains in biodiversity. Where proposals fall within or adjacent to a BOA, biodiversity measures should support that BOA's objectives. The Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) will set out guidance on how this can be achieved. European sites designated as Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), National Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), local SNCIs and Local Nature Reserves are all shown on the Policies Map or as subsequently updated.

Policy 14 goes on to say that "Permission will not be granted for proposals that are likely to materially harm the nature conservation interests of local sites unless clear justification is provided that the need for development clearly outweighs the impact on biodiversity."

2.3 The UK Biodiversity Action Plan
The UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UK BAP) describes the UK's biological resources. In Surrey recognised priority habitats include lowland dry acid grassland, lowland meadows, flood plain grazing marsh, wet woodland, hedgerows and arable field margins. It is known that farmland offers important habitat for wildlife. The UK BAP also identifies priority species for conservation which include rare and also declining species of mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, fish, plants, mosses, lichens and fungi. Examples of priority species in Surrey include farmland birds which should be protected from further decline by maintaining and enhancing current populations wherever possible. As it says: "Development could impact on these species by direct loss of habitat, but also through increased recreational disturbance; especially associated with residential developments."

The proposed area for development in Normandy and Flexford encompasses many of the above biological resources, recognised priority habitats and priority species for conservation. It is also relevant to the Biodiversity Plan for Surrey (see 2.4 below).

2.4 The Biodiversity Plan for Surrey

The Biodiversity Plan for Surrey (BPS) incorporates changes brought about by the NPPF, identifies the importance of Ancient Woodland and veteran trees for biodiversity interest. Such habitats support woodland plants with limited dispersal abilities, mammals such as bats and dormice which are protected species, as well as woodland birds and butterflies (many of which are in decline nationally), invertebrates and often lichen, mosses and fungi.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2190</th>
<th>Respondent: 15371361 / Friends of Normandy Wildlife (Alistair Lawson)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3.1 Policy A46: GBC have failed to take into consideration the impacts upon wildlife and habitats both within the proposed development site and in SSSI's and SNCI's in the surrounding area in breach of Section 11 of the NPPF (see 2.1 above)

3.1.1 Impact on the wider environment of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area

We believe that the Plan is unsound in relation to Policy A46 as the Habitats Regulations Assessment prepared for GBC does not take sufficient account of the impact that this huge proposed development specifically will have upon the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA) which is a European Site as defined under the Habitats Directive and Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended).

The proposed development is considerably less than five kilometres away from the TBH SPA and not much beyond the 400m exclusion zone, occupying an area between under km, to just over 2km, from the TBH SPA. It has been indicated that the cumulative effect of further residential development up to 5 km from protected heathlands will have a significant adverse effect on the heaths. Furthermore, Natural England believes that recreational use of the heaths arising from housing developments up to five kilometres away from a SPA will create disturbance to rare bird populations. The TBH SPA is an internationally important habitat for three rare species of bird - the Dartford warbler, woodlark and nightjar. The latter two are ground nesting and therefore particularly susceptible to disturbance from people and animals.

We therefore question whether enough - or indeed any - consideration been given to the potentially detrimental effect that the proposed strategic development between Normandy and Flexford will have on this internationally important site.

A survey in 2008 showed that more than 83% of visitors to the SPA arrived by car and that 70% of those had come from within 5km of its access point. A very large proportion of the TBH SPA visitors are dog walkers, many of whom visit a
particular site on a regular basis. Two hundred and sixty four dogs are likely to come with the proposed development, the current ratio of dogs per household being 24/100, so this could potentially attract between 26 and 132 extra dog-walkers a day.

To deter dog-walkers from visiting the TBH SPA, any Suitable Alternative Green Space (SANG) in the proposed development would have to be of exceptional quality, as the Nightingale Road and Dolley's Hill entrances to the TBH SPA are only either 5 minutes away by car, or 20 minutes on foot. Whatever the size, the SANG would be a very small area in which to exercise 264 dogs. A small number of irresponsible dog owners, who do not scoop the poop, will make such a small area unattractive for walk and play. This is already a problem on Normandy Common.

Another factor is that some areas where a SANG might be located are muddy in wet weather and throughout the winter, whereas many of the tracks on the TBH SPA are dry in wet weather, including the winter. For those dissatisfied with the proposed SANG for whatever reason, or those wanting a longer walk, the natural alternative is the TBH SPA. If only 10% of dog owners use the TBH SPA, there would be 26 extra dogs a day using the TBH SPA; if 50% do, it would be an extra 132 dogs a day.

**Friends of Normandy Wildlife believe, that given the proximity of the proposed development to two entrances to the TBH SPA it will be impossible to design a SANG that will deter many residents from using the TBH SPA to walk their dogs. This will have a very serious impact on the wildlife and overall environment (unique flora and fauna) of this internationally important area.**

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2191  **Respondent:** 15371361 / Friends of Normandy Wildlife (Alistair Lawson)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

### 3.1.2 Impact of increased volumes of traffic on wildlife

If the proposed development goes ahead, there will be an increase in pollution with respect to air quality, noise and light levels, particularly where cars have to queue at junctions or obstructions. The transport strategy proposed by GBC for this strategic site contains no scheduled improvements for Glaziers Lane and very few for Westwood Lane, both rural lanes. The A323 to the North of the site will also be affected, and very few improvements to that road are planned.

This will affect not only the people living in the area but also local wildlife. Natural England addressed this issue in: 'The ecological effects of air pollution from road transport' (2016) which states that: "Biodiversity 2020 identifies air pollution as a direct threat to biodiversity in England. Many habitats of nature conservation importance in the UK are nutrient-conditions and/or are vulnerable to acidification, and are sensitive to additional airborne nitrogen oxides (NOx), sulphur dioxide (SO2) and ammonia (NH3), as well as to nitrogen deposition and acid deposition." In addition, noise from traffic can result in hearing loss in animals. It masks important environmental clues and animal signals. It can result in stress and induce behavioural effects, such as abandonment of territory. With regard to light, predators use light to hunt, and prey species: use darkness as cover. Thus increased light at night alters the predator/prey balance and can also affect breeding behaviour in many species.

The environment and the wildlife in and around the four designated SNCIs on the A323 in Normandy i.e. Wyke Churchyard SNCI, Normandy Common SNCI, Wanborough and Normandy Woods SNCI (northernmost wood) and Wyke School Woods SNCI, all of which border the road, will be adversely affected by increased traffic and associated pollution. The UK BAP Traditional Orchard Habitat in Glaziers Lane will also be affected.

Another road where traffic will also be significantly increased is the A324. This borders the TBH SPA and increased traffic and pollution will therefore have an adverse effect on the heathland.
The increase in volume of traffic resulting from the proposed A46 development will reduce Biodiversity and harm wildlife. The transport strategy for the area does nothing to mitigate for this and does little to reduce the number of additional motorised vehicles on the roads around the site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7513  Respondent: 15380929 / Elizabeth Coates  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the planning application A46 Normandy & Flexford’s ‘strategic site’ under the GBC’s Local Plan.

The reasons for my objection are as follows:

1) **The development of 1,100 houses is simply excessive.** This development alone will double the population of the village and is clearly of a grossly inappropriate scale.

2) **The destruction of the green belt and of village life.** I moved to the area when the 2014 consultation was underway. The area currently being considered for development was a safeguarded area and was not removed from greenbelt. The attraction of moving here was for village life, the openness of the village and the views. All of these will be destroyed by the proposals and exceptional circumstances of why the development is needed have not been demonstrated.

3) **This is against the wishes of the village residents.** My understanding is that this development should reflect the needs and priorities of the community. The proposal does not reflect the needs and priorities of the community and is against the wishes of the village residents and so the application should be turned down.

4) **The local infrastructure simply cannot support these extra houses.** This will put huge pressure on the doctors surgery, primary school, sewer system, gas supply, water supply/drainage and the roads will be chaos. None of which seem to be in line for upgrades to cope with the additional population.

5) **The proposed development would lead to traffic chaos.** At peak times especially the following areas simply will not be able to cope:

   1. The A323 around Wood Street barely copes as it is.
   2. The A323 towards Ash already suffers from long queues, in part due to the railway crossing at Ash and the narrow roads through Ash.
   3. Westwood Lane is single track under the railway bridge. If the majority of the access to the new development is from Westwood Lane it will bear the brunt of the additional traffic.
   4. The junction of Wanborough Hill, the B3000 and the A3 is already extremely congested often backing all the way back to the junction of the A3 at Compton.
   5. Due to the constraints of the railway bridge on Westwood lane, large vehicles such as Lorries and double decker buses are already routed down Glaziers lane an unclassified road and one that already backs up easily with any problems on the A3 or the A31.
   6. The junctions of Westwood lane and Glaziers Lane with the A323 are already problem areas in peak times. A development of the scale proposed with access mainly off Westwood lane and Glaziers lane will compound the problem to an unacceptable level.

It is ridiculous to assume that the majority of the additional traffic from the development will go by rail. The majority of traffic will go by road. It will cost the council a fortune to upgrade all of these roads to avoid traffic chaos.
6) **The volume of traffic already makes walking to Wyke School dangerous.** The additional traffic will make it even worse, the pavements are not on both sides of the road are narrow and badly maintained and most of the pavements are unlit.

7) **The development and resulting traffic will cause excessive air and noise pollution.**

8) **The destruction of ancient woodland and wildlife habitats.** The proposed development contains several important wildlife habitats and ancient woodland which can’t be replaced or maintained by ‘wildlife corridors’. Also part of the charm of living in a village is the wildlife. A development of this size, along with the resulting air, noise and light pollution, will have terrible consequences on the local wildlife.

9) **The exceptional need for a secondary school has not been proven.** The local primary school is only 1 form entry and therefore the remaining 6 forms would need to brought in from outside areas. This is not sustainable. The majority of the pupils will come by road not by train and even if many they are bused in the local road can’t cope with that increased traffic pressure.

10) **Merging of residential areas.** This proposal effectively joins Normandy and Flexford together. The green belt is designed to stop this happening so that the character of our countryside can be preserved. With large developments already underway in Ash and Tongham, the west of the borough threatens to merge into one large urban sprawl.

11) **Increased flooding.** Much of the area in the A46 site is prone to flooding already. An increase in concrete will exacerbate this and lead to increased problems for existing residents let alone the new houses which are very likely to be affected.

In conclusion, I object to the plans for the A46 Normandy & Flexford’s ‘strategic site’. I trust that this proposal will be rightly rejected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2261  **Respondent:** 15381025 / Nick Coates  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**I object** to the planning application A46 Normandy & Flexford’s ‘strategic site’ under the GBC’s Local Plan.

The reasons for my objection are as follows:

1) **The development of 1,100 houses is simply excessive.** It is doubling the size of the village!

2) **The destruction of the green belt and of village life.** The area currently being considered for development was a safeguarded area and was not removed from greenbelt following the 2014 consultation. The attraction of living in Normandy is to have a village life, the openness of the village and the views. All of these will be destroyed by the proposals and exceptional circumstances of why the development is needed have not been demonstrated.

3) **This is against the wishes of the village residents.** My understanding is that this development should reflect the needs and priorities of the community. The proposal does not reflect the needs and priorities of the community and is against the wishes of the village residents and so the application should be turned down.
4) **The local infrastructure simply cannot support these extra houses.** This development will put huge pressure on the doctors surgery, primary school, utilities and the roads will be chaos. In rush hour the following areas simply will not be able to cope:

1. The A323 around Wood Street barely copes as it is.
2. The A323 towards Ash already suffers from long queues, in part due to the railway crossing at Ash and the narrow roads through Ash.
3. Westwood Lane is single track under the railways bridge. If the majority of the access to the new development is from Westwood Lane it will bear the brunt of the additional traffic. It will be chaos with the single track section and can double decker busses even get under it to reach the school?
4. The junction of Wanborough Hill, the B3000 and the A3 is already really bad.

It is a ridiculous assumption that the majority of the additional traffic from the development will go by rail. The majority of traffic will go by road. It will cost the council a fortune to upgrade all of these roads to avoid traffic chaos. The council are being short sighted by even considering this proposal.

5) **The additional traffic will make walking to Wyke school dangerous.** There aren’t pavements on both sides of the road and most of the pavements are unlit.

6) **The development and resulting traffic will cause air and noise pollution.**

7) **If a secondary school is needed, then this should simply be built without the rest of the development.** If a secondary school is needed, this is what taxes are for. The school should simply be built without the condition of completely destroying the green belt by building 1,100 homes.

8) **This proposal from the developer is akin to the government/council accepting a bribe.** If the developer was giving £10m of cash (instead of an asset of a free school) to “get this development through” people would end up in jail.

9) **The destruction of ancient woodland and wildlife habitats.** To destroy or endanger ancient woodland is simply inexcusable. Having this is part of the charm of living in a village is the wildlife. A development of this size, along with the resulting air, noise and light pollution, will have terrible consequences on the local wildlife.

10) **This isn’t the only proposal to build houses in the area.** There are a number of proposals to build thousands of houses all around the area. It would awful if all of the land between villages is in filled with houses as all of the residential areas together will be linked together. The green belt is designed to stop this happening – so stop building on the green belt!

In conclusion, I object to the plans for the A46 Normandy & Flexford’s ‘strategic site’. I trust that this grossly excessive proposal will be rightly rejected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
traffic is held up waiting for cars to pass through the bridge. If the secondary school is built, the amount of traffic created by dropping off and picking up kids would increase drastically and the single lane railway bridge would not be able to accommodate for the amount of vehicles that are on the road, creating severe delays, even if measures such as a traffic light system were introduced. Also, the amount of air pollution in this rural area would soar and the rural reputation of the area would be ruined.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Comment ID: PSLPS16/2422  Respondent: 15390817 / Judith Baker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to object to the proposed new development of Normandy and Flexford. It is disproportionate and unjustified.

Key Points.

School - Is there a proven need for a new school in this area? Why do we need another secondary school when we have schools in the area which are under subscribed!

Expansion to existing schools could be a better and cheaper option.

Roads - To build another 1100 house would double the size of this Village - increasing traffic in an already busy area. We are queuing in the peak times to get onto the main 'A' roads. Westwood and Glaziers Lane are just that 'Lanes' with narrow railway bridges and one way traffic in places, there is no room to widen these roads to cope with the extra traffic this building plan would bring. We already have problems with queuing traffic on the main Guildford to Aldershot road - with so much building in this surrounding area what is proposed to help ease congestion?

Health issues for residents - there will be so much traffic that the air pollution will be very poor together with the years of works traffic which will create noise and pollution. What considerations have the council given to this?

Green Belt - If this development is built it will increase Normandy by 100% ripping through the heart of the Village and destroying our rural environment. I have lived in Normandy all my life and have seen the increase in our wildlife as never before, a pleasure to see, but built on this land and you destroy all that is good in our Village our rural environment. The loss of beautiful views, green pastures, important hedgerows, streams and trees, the list is endless and you would destroy all! What ever happened to the 'Protection of Green Belt'? It seems to me that this is forgotten about when local authorities can gain, they move the goal post to suit them!!

I hope you will think again and have some respect for this Village and its people - don't change our green fields into an urban sprawl. Let's remain the 'Surrey Hills' and not become known as the 'Surrey Builds'!!!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2453  Respondent: 15397665 / George Clant  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am not going to write pages why I am opposed to the development in Normandy area. My objections are:-

1) We do not need another school as it has been proved that existing schools in Ash and Guildford are already underused and now another one planned in Worplesdon.
2) Go for another traveller site. [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s
duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected
characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share
it]

3) Enlarging the station car park. Passengers are already using our roads for parking as the railway charges are
prohibitive.

4) Recently I helped an elderly friend in Westwood Lane by cutting her grass. During that hour 180 vehicles passed me
and that was when there were no accidents on the A3 or A31. This was not during the rush hour. With narrow and twisted
railway bridges in Glaziers and Westwood Lanes (they are not designated as roads) movement would become very
difficult.

5) No shops would be able to compete with Tesco, Sainsbury etc and with the big increase in online shopping. As a child
I remember there were 23 businesses in Normandy. Now we have a garage not selling petrol, a music shop for the
unprofessionals and a milkman delivery about 100 pints just twice a week.

The loss of arable land is a main concern and I am glad I shall not be around when fertile land is governed by buildings.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Please accept this letter as an objection on all accounts to the building development proposal on the land with boundaries
Westwood Lane to the West, Glaziers Lane to the east, Guildford Road to the North and the Railway Line to the South.

This horrendous proposal of 1100 houses, plus other unnecessary buildings, is totally out of keeping with the local area
and would effectively double the population of our village.

The government statement: "there are no plans to relax strong protections that prevent inappropriate development on the
green belt" would be completely undermined by success of this proposal.

The local population would incur many years of disruption, noise and pollution.

The surrounding roads already cannot support the existing load at peak times without long queues. There would be traffic
chaos both during and after the development.

On completion, the valley, north of the middle of the Hogs Back would be scarred and lit up like a beacon at night.

The rural environment that the majority of the local population support would be destroyed forever.

There are many more small pockets of land in the local area enclosed by residential and commercial properties that would
be more suited to progressive sustainable development to meet the needs of the local population. The Council should show
a more proactive support for the development of these areas for efficient residential expansion.

There are also brown field and unused commercial sites within the perimeter of Guildford town and in the outlying
districts which could be redeveloped for housing needs before destroying the open arable land of the countryside.
The need for a 1500 pupil secondary school in this area is unsubstantiated and is a red herring to gain housing development approval. Some schools to the west of Guildford are currently under subscribed and others have the capability and willingness for expansion. The slow population growth does not support the need for additional schools.

Similarly the need for retail development is also unsubstantiated and in fact all household supply shops that were core to the village 45 years ago have failed and are now out of business. There are numerous retail facilities offering a wide range of merchandise within a six mile radius of the village which the local population have shown to prefer.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4014  Respondent: 15400257 / D J Brock  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Please accept this letter as an objection to the recent disclosure of a building development proposal on the land with boundaries Westwood lane to the west, Glaziers Lane to the east, Guildford Road to the North and the Railway Line to the South.

This horrendous proposal of 1100 houses, plus other unnecessary buildings, is totally out of keeping with the local area and would effectively double the population of our village. The government statement: "there are no plans to relax strong protections that prevent inappropriate development on the green belt" would be completely undermined by success of this proposal.

The local population would incur many years of disruption, noise and pollution. The surrounding roads already cannot support the existing load at peak times without long queues. There would be traffic chaos both during and after the development. On completion, the valley north of the middle of the Hogs Back would be lit up like a beacon.

The rural environment that the majority of the local population support would be destroyed forever.

There are many more small pockets of land in the local area enclosed by residential and commercial properties that would be more suited to sustainable development to meet the needs of the local population. There are also brown field and unused commercial sites within the perimeter of Guildford town and in the outlying districts which could be redeveloped for housing needs before destroying the open arable land of the countryside.

The need for a 1500 pupil secondary school in this area is unsubstantiated and is a red herring to gain housing development approval. Similarly, the need for retail development is also unsubstantiated and in fact all household supply shops that were core to the village 45 years ago have failed and are now out of business.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2494  Respondent: 15400449 / P Brock  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
This awful proposal of 1100 houses and other buildings is totally out of keeping with the local area and would double the population of our village.

The rural environment of the local population support would be destroyed forever.

Disruption and both noise and air pollution would affect the local population for many years during and after the development.

Transport on the surrounding roads is already a problem. The existing infrastructure cannot support the existing load at peak times without long queues. There would be traffic chaos both during and after the development.

During development and after completion, the valley viewed from Hogs Back would be scarred forever and lit up like a beacon at night.

Small pockets of land in the local area enclosed by residential and commercial properties would be more suited to sustainable development to meet the needs of the local population. The Council should show more support for the development of these areas.

Brown field and unused commercial sites within the perimeter of Guildford town and in the outlying districts should be redeveloped for housing needs before destroying the open arable land of the countryside.

The need for a 1500 pupil secondary school in this area is unsubstantiated. Some schools within the Guildford Borough are currently under subscribed and others have the ability for expansion. The population growth does not support the need for additional schools.

A need for retail development is unsubstantiated. All household supply shops that were core to the village have failed and are now out of business. The local retail facilities offering a wide range of merchandise within a reasonable distance of the village have proven to be adequate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Dear Sir / Madam

We object to the proposed large scale development planned for 1100 new dwellings and a 1000 place secondary school on two Green Belt sites in Normandy and Flexford. (Site A46) Current population 3000 inhabitants - proposal 100% increase.

**Insufficient infrastructure / amenities:**

- No retail shops, except for a music store
- No Post Office / No Bank / No Library
- No Public House / Restaurant
- Doctors surgery over subscribed resulting in residents travelling to Fairlands for appointments (approx distance 2.5 miles)
Minimal local employment
Lack of Infrastructure
Existing traffic congestion and consequent safety issues
Electricity supply already insufficient for local residents, there are many power cuts
Broadband already insufficient for local need
Flood area

**Green Belt**

Normandy and Flexford are located in the Green Belt. National policy retains strong protections against inappropriate development for valuable areas such as the Green Belt and states that planning should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

**National Planning Policy Framework**

NPPF, paragraph 80 exists to safeguard the countryside from encroachment and to retain a Green Belt buffer to stop urban areas from merging. It also requires that Green Belt boundaries should be permanent (para 83) and to prevent urban sprawl (para 70) by keeping land permanently open.

The Guildford Landscape Character Assessment should be an important consideration in any review of the Green Belt.

**Special Protection Area**

The proposed development areas are within a 400 metres - five kilometres protection zone of the Special Protection Area (SPA). All sites require Strategic Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) to be found in advance before any development can be considered. The proximity of more people and the associated air pollution from the associated anticipated car journeys is a threat to SPA status and the flora and fauna that dwell there.

**Secondary School**

There are 'no exceptional circumstances' to remove the proposed development site from The Green Belt. The secondary school is a new addition to The Local Plan as a strategy to enable this developer led proposal. There is no need for an additional secondary school whilst other secondary schools in the local area are substantially undersubscribed. This school would be an unviable project and a serious waste of tax payers money.

**Infrastructure**

**Roads** Access to the proposed development sites would be via rural residential roads which are ill equipped to deal with any increase in traffic.
Glaziers Lane - unclassified road (060) - no continual footpath, pedestrians would have to cross the road at several places or risk walking in the road. Railway Bridge with limited visibility and hazardous station access. Route would be hazardous for cyclists.

Westwood Lane - C Class road (C16) rural residential road. No continual footpath. Single track road under Railway Bridge with 14'3" restricted height access. Route would be hazardous for cyclists.


These roads are already seriously overburdened and access is already restricted. At the northern end access onto the A323 is difficult; particularly from Glaziers Lane where traffic backs up substantially and where there have already been fatalities. At this junction volume of traffic and excessive axle weights caused subterranean damage to gas and water services in 2013 leading twice to extensive, disruptive and costly deep repairs to stabilise the sub soil. The A323 has been identified in GBCs 'Options Growth Scenario Transport Assessment Report' as being at full capacity already. Extra development in the area will cause additional serious access problems and safety issues.

Railway Station - access onto Glaziers Lane - a tight turn northbound from the station with the vulnerability of unsighted vehicles coming over the Railway Bridge. Disabled access only on one side. Approximately 8 car parking spaces. Liable to flooding.

Flooding
Normandy and Flexford are situated on the slopes of the Hog's Back. They are subject to frequent flooding due to the high water table and clay composition soil. The drainage and sewage system are already inadequate for current needs. A development of this size would create further problems.

In summary we feel that this excessive scale development is inappropriate for this rural Green Belt area. Environmentally it is wrong. The infrastructure and amenities are inadequate to support a development of this size. No necessity has been identified for an additional secondary school in the area while other local secondary schools are undersubscribed and can potentially increase in size on their present sites if the need ever arose.

We would wish you to take our concerns and objections into consideration.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7492</th>
<th>Respondent: 15408001 / Lesley Bond</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am a resident of Normandy. I have lived here for 40 years.

I strongly object to the disproportionate scale of the proposed new A46 development. In 2014's consultation is was safeguarded. Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated or approved by the inspectorate. A 100% increase in the number of homes in the village will destroy the natural environment. The fundamental aim of "green belt" policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. GBC is ignoring Past verdicts of planning inspectors that the green fields of Normandy (A46) contribute to the openness of this area of Surrey Green Belt and to the panoramic view of the green fields to the Surrey Hills AONB. Development should not be approved except in very special circumstances (NPPF).

GBC is required to demonstrate "exceptionally Circumstances' to justify the release of sit A46 from Green Belt. There is no clear evidence of these exceptional circumstances within the LP.

I also object to the proposals because the extra traffic generated by so many new homes will cause chaos. The A323 is already often congested, especially at peak times in the mornings and evenings. It is regularly gridlocked when accidents occur in Guildford, on the Hogs Back and Aldershot. The minor roads - Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane will not be able to cope with the extra traffic which the extra 1100 homes will generate. The railway bridges on both roads will be put under enormous stress. There will also be a massive increase in exhaust pollution of NOX and CO2. This cannot be desirable. Planning Policy has not fully considered the location of the site & the traffic impact A46 will have on this rural community.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3229</th>
<th>Respondent: 15408001 / Lesley Bond</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I support the withdrawl of Policy A46

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2757</th>
<th>Respondent: 15422785 / Andrea Robinson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft local plan for Normandy and Flexford which has yet to be approved by the GBC Executive will involve building on green belt land. I had understood that this area was a strategic site (Site 368) and described as safeguarded in GBC’s 2014 local plan. I don’t believe that there are exceptional circumstances requiring it’s removal.
I would like to register my objection to the local plan as I believe it is indefensible to build on this green belt land because:

- there is no evidence for the need for a school. Surrey’s secondary schools are expanding and Ash Manor and King’s College are undersubscribed. Building in this way in Normandy does not follow a ‘sensitivity’ approach to the green belt and justifying the plan by saying there is a need for a school incorrect.
- the traffic congestion that would follow such a development would be unsustainable. There are already unmanageable traffic problems during rush hour and this plan would compound the problem.
- 100% increase in the number of homes in Normandy would destroy the rural environment. I often hear cuckoos, deer live in the local forested areas, we have protected newts, rare orchids and so on. Lifestyles in this semi-rural area will be completely changed and the beauty of the local area devastated.
- we are close to Surrey Hills AONB and the plan would remove our panoramic views and green fields.
- brown field sites should be built on first. There are many other areas around Guildford which could be considered to be more suitable for development such as Epsom Road, West Horsley. Normandy and Flexford is not surrounded by existing development, on a strategic highway route, it is not low quality green belt land or visually self-contained. This development proposal does not protect the highest quality green belt and countryside.
- the plan breaks election promises not to build on green sites and to make sure that planning decisions are made by local people. This plan was devised without the knowledge of or consultation with local people.
- sustainability and sensitivity scores have been skewed. Treating Normandy and Flexford as one settlement for the purposes of sustainability and separately for sensitivity, results in maximized and minimized scores respectively has rigged the statistics.

Please note also that Natural England is there to protect our countryside and therefore the THBSPA. Normandy is within the 5 mile protection zone and 1.5km away from the proposal. I’ll be contacting them with my concerns over the future of our Special Protection Area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I would like to add my objection to the proposed massive development of Normandy for the following reasons:

1) I do not oppose some development, say 100-200 houses in the village if it is well planned with retail outlet etc, but the proposed 1100 is just crazy and totally out of proportion to the size of the village.

2) The road through Normandy already queues in rush hour, it could never cope with all the extra houses in Normandy, Ash and Tongham. New roads would be necessary.

3) The land flash floods, developing it will cause further flooding in the village.

4) It really 8 form ‘entry’ rather than a 8 form total school? Is that 8 forms x 7 years x 30 pupils = 1680 pupils in a small village!! How could Glaziers Lane and the surrounding lanes cope with that!

I realise there is pressure to develop further areas, but it really seems that no thought or logic has gone into this proposal whatsoever. It even makes one wonder if there is some kind of hidden financial interest to propose such a crazy scheme.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I am writing to object to the above proposed submission (Local Plan) for Normandy and Flexford

My objections area as follows:

1. The proposed development (1100 homes) is developer led with the carrot of them providing land for a secondary school – which is not needed

The two local secondary’s (Ash Manor and Kings College/Park Barn) are both undersubscribed and have extra capacity for expansion should they reach their capacities on their present sites and are willing to expand should the need arise – money would be better spent improving and upgrading these.

2. Other secondary’s in the area are also expanding school places at Guildford county and St Peters, Merrow.

Infrastructure – Traffic for the proposal (school and homes) would feed on to minor roads and not directly onto A class roads so causing further strain and overload onto the village at Peak Times. The A323 is already well over capacity and any problems on the A31(Hogs Back) causes and lock regularly

There are no plans to upgrade/improve the A323 in the foreseeable future
Furthermore Westwood lane and Glaziers lane are both bisected by the railway line – both are ‘dog-legged’ and one can only take alternative flow traffic

- Exceptional Circumstances – GBC has to demonstrate such circumstances to justify releasing site A46 from the green belt – it has not done this there is no evidence let alone clear evidence, furthermore
  1. Environmental aspects have been disregarded
  2. Flexford and Normandy are separate settlements but have been ‘lumped together’ for simplistic and analytical purposes
  3. Flooding has been ignored and is a problem
  4. The doubling of the population is not viable nor sustainable

1. In conclusion I strongly oppose the proposed development. Development of brownfield sites, smaller, sensitive and logical methodology is needed where expansion is scattered and better planned

Existing approvals gained by developers that they are merely ‘sitting on’ looks better as an appreciating ‘asset’ on their balance sheet should be developed first-will a ‘stick’ if necessary (ie rescind the approvals).

The University is also sitting on land until permission for student accommodation AND staff accommodation – exactly where it is needed! This would free up property around the town where it is most needed and minimise the burden on infrastructure.

The deep mistrust that GBC exudes is enormous – villagers do not trust their councils – recent events in the past 2-3 years has fuelled this. The council has little to be proud of in the way this and previous planning policy local plans have been handled

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2880  **Respondent:** 15428193 / David Simmons  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I am writing with regards to the Guildford Local Plan and Policy A46 to which I OBJECT.

Normandy has no internal demand for a secondary school and the rationale for the 1100 homes proposed by GBC to be built on Green Belt land, is that this school will accommodate the increase in population.

The argument proposed by GBC for provision of a secondary school and housing thus, is in fact a circular argument.

The argument is thereby clearly flawed, does not justify the development and cannot be considered in the Local Plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS172/2278  **Respondent:** 15432705 / Gordon Bennett  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I am writing with regards to the Guildford Local Plan and Policy A46 to which I OBJECT.

Normandy has no internal demand for a secondary school and the rationale for the 1100 homes proposed by GBC to be built on Green Belt land, is that this school will accommodate the increase in population.

The argument proposed by GBC for provision of a secondary school and housing thus, is in fact a circular argument.

The argument is thereby clearly flawed, does not justify the development and cannot be considered in the Local Plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.

With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become even more biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3029</th>
<th>Respondent: 15433633 / Mike Allcock</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A46 NORMANDY I FLEXFORD

- This is a village development / village extension and as such is inconsistent with national policy which favours leaving the integrity of villages intact. The universal opposition of the inclusion of this site from local villagers is entirely understandable
- The boundaries will require sensitive design and are not consistent with government policy of ensuring that any boundary changes to the green belt will have a degree of permanency
- There are flooding / drainage issues
- Infrastructure issues - These will clearly take considerable time to resolve bringing into question the possible commencement date. In particular, the traffic increase through the local villages will be significant
- Listed buildings and ancient wood lands complicate the development

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3041</th>
<th>Respondent: 15434177 / June Newell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The roads are small, narrow and unclassified and as such the plans for a large scale development would result in a road system that would be unable to cope.
2. The area is known for flooding and sewage problems and as a result these facilities would be unable to cope.
3. There is a large selection of local secondary schools, many that are under subscribed that would render any planned secondary school as unnecessary.
4. The area is an historic green belt area and a large scale development would spoil this for future generations.
5. The village of Normandy provides us with a true village feel that would be lost with a development of this size.

I hope you will consider my objections to the proposal at A46 on the draft local plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1557</th>
<th>Respondent: 15434433 / James Collins</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.

With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become *even more* biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11,350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4,613) are *within 3 miles of Send Marsh*, most of them on Green Belt. This is *grossly unfair* on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3060</th>
<th>Respondent: 15434753 / Hilary Clements</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lastly in respect of Policy A46 there is nothing in the local plan which gives any evidence of 'exceptional circumstances' to justify the release of site A46 from the Green Belt. So why does there need to be development in this area instead of other locations around the borough?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3066</th>
<th>Respondent: 15434913 / Margaret Amos</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I **OBJECT** to:
1) I refer to site A46 in your proposal to build 1100 homes on land that has not been removed from the Metropolitan Green Belt, and exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated or approved.

2) There are approximately 3,000 residents in Normandy, and the majority of them wish for Normandy to remain a village with the sense of community that brings. We have no need for a secondary school, as both Ash Manor and Kings College, which serve this parish are under subscribed and have room for expansion as and when necessary. Surely the residents needs and priorities come first.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3069</th>
<th>Respondent: 15434913 / Margaret Amos</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I also object on the grounds of destruction of the wildlife that live along side is in this area (A46). I have an allotment on Westwood Lane, and know from experience that there are little owls nesting in an oak tree next door, and on walks along the nearby public footpaths, I have seen grass snakes and adders, hedgehogs, toads and slow worms as well as a great variety of butterflies including the small tortoise shell, which is becoming rare. Any large development would destroy all of this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3075</th>
<th>Respondent: 15434913 / Margaret Amos</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a proposed development for 350 homes to be built at Fairlands- Rokers land with land given for provision of a secondary school there. So why build a school at Normandy? There is simply no need.

And lastly, I object on the grounds that everyone on of us needs wide open spaces, trees, woods and hedges, some peaceful place, and clean air to breathe. So, Normandy can and does provide this, for not just the residents, but also nearby by towns, especially as places like Ash and Tongham which are becoming more and more urbanised. It is often reported in the press by the medical profession that stress levels are immediately lowered by a visit to a peaceful quiet country area, (such as Normandy) so the heath benefits are essential. We do not want to become part of the urban sprawl planned by Guildford Borough council.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3098</th>
<th>Respondent: 15437313 / Sarah Gooden</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )  

ENVIRONMENT  

We object to the development proposed by GBC as 20 years of research evidence has shown that the continual fragmentation of natural habitat has caused the dramatic decline of our birds and wildlife species to levels when even our most popular species are under threat. Gardens planned for this development are not enough to combat this decline.

All habitat within or adjoining the parcel of land called A46 are priority habitats under the NERC Act including protected species. Therefore it is vital that this is a key consideration when drafting the Local Plan. However GBC has failed to adequately consider the protection of wildlife within Policy 14.

The following are becoming increasingly rare in the local area:-
Hedgehogs, Dormice, Great Crested Newts, Barn Owls, Stag Beatles, Skylarks, Toads, Lizards, Grass Snakes, Adders, Slow worms, Badgers, Bats.

There are vitally important ecological networks (green infrastructure corridors) that surround A46 (namely Ancient and Semi-natural Woodland, Veteran Trees, Hedgerows, Semi-improved Grassland, Farmland and the Stream which flows along the back of Guildford Road properties lining the field at the back of The Old Vicarage, Wyke). These connect to other important and protected sites within Normandy Parish and the wider countryside (namely Wanborough and Normandy Woods Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI), A47 The Paddocks SNCI, Normandy Pond SNCI (into which the stream runs), Normandy Common SNCI (put forward by the Surrey Local Nature Partnership in 2015), Wyke Churchyard SNCI and Little Flexford SNCI.)

This site is in close proximity (0.8 km) to the European Nature 2000 "Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area" that hosts 3 rare ground-nesting bird species in a rare heathland habitat.

GBC should apply constraints when calculating the overall housing target in the Borough because of the TBHSPA (NPPF). GBC has not applied constraints and so are compromising sensitive 'designated wildlife sites and landscapes' for pro development. A46 is an 'unsustainable' development so therefore fails Policy 5.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3104  Respondent: 15437313 / Sarah Gooden  Agent:  

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )  

A46 WAS NOT PROPOSED OR CONSIDERED AS A STRATEGIC SITE IN THE FIRST CONSULTATION  

A46 'strategic site', was not previously proposed in an earlier consultation It is not appropriate development at this stage. In 2014's consultation A46 was 'safeguarded'. It was not removed from the Metropolitan Greenbelt. 'Exceptional circumstances' have not been demonstrated or approved by the Inspectorate. You can't just inset boundaries around pieces of greenbelt, A46/A47/A50 and urbanise them. They must remain Green Belt, according to the recent Solihull ruling. So we object to GBC's proposal to build over Green Belt land with the Local Plan.

In addition there has been no meaningful engagement made or requested from local people. We object to the fact that GBC have not listened to residents and have breached the National Planning Policy Frarrnewora (NPPF).  

Sensitivity versus Sustainability
We understand that two of the key concepts that underpin the Local Plan are: Sustainability and Sensitivity. Individual settlements are ranked on both counts and development is favoured in the most sustainable ones whereas it is least favoured in the most sensitive ones. What is significant here is that for the purposes of assessing Sustainability, Normandy and Flexford have been treated as one settlement which maximises its score on this count - whereas in terms of Green Belt Sensitivity the open area between the two settlements is disregarded which reduces our score on that one. This is simply inconsistent. Infact the original data (used in the first consultation) identified Normandy as one settlement The data was rewritten in 2014 dividing the settlements in two. Data cannot be changed.

We object to the deliberately misleading and inconsistent calculations used to override our Green Belt. GBC’s intention to build 1,100 new homes in Normandy and Flexford shows no objective assessment of the needs of existing residents in these settlements.

Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area’s SANG Avoidance Strategy is about to expire (2016). We object to the fact that a new Avoidance Strategy for TBHSPA is not available. There is 'bespoke' SANG on A46 but there is no guarantee the SANG will be delivered by the developer.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3128  Respondent: 15439393 / Elise Clements  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Lastly in respect of Policy A46 there is nothing in the local plan which gives any evidence of 'exceptional circumstances' to justify the release of site A46 from the Green Belt. So why does there need to be development in this area instead of other locations around the borough?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3201  Respondent: 15440801 / H.V. Newman  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to object to the local plan for Normandy for all the following reasons. Site A46

1. Normandy and Flexford are within the green belt. “exceptional circumstances” have not been approved by the inspectorate. The government’s pledge to safeguard the green belt is not being upheld.
2. The green belt status is given because of the open space surrounding the village which provides a buffer zone between ash and Guildford on either side, this would be lost if the development went ahead.
3. NPFF15 states: “early and meaningful engagement with neighbourhoods, local organisations is essential” – no one has consulted with us. It has come to light that Taylor Wimpey 2 years ago submitted plans for the development of this area to ABC Planning Policy. No word to the local council (Parish Council) was reported. The local residents were left in the dark, is this legal?
4. The size of the development proposed is out of all proportion to the area. A 1,500 place secondary school is not necessary this side of Guildford, as all schools do not have their full complement in the numbers of pupils that coned the allocated and most of the schools have room for expansion in the future.

5. Guildford borough council have skewed the data to suit their objective by combining Normandy and Flexford for the purpose of sustainability, but separated the two areas for the purpose of sensitivity so that it appears in favour of planning applications. The original data used in the first consultation identified Normandy as only one settlement. Rewritten in 2014 it was divided. Data surely cannot be changed for the convenience of planning.

6. Flood issues have not been considered by GBC, now those recognised on the environmental agencies flood alert map 3a and 3b, which disregards the “effective flood-plain” of 3b and will therefore place a severe impact on those areas identified in the SWMP

7. There will be a threat to the Thames Basin Heath Special protection Area. There will be the erosion of ancient woodland and species of fauna and flora would suffer. A46 strategic site is situated within the protection zone of the TBHSPA, which contains an (SSSI) recognised as one of the key Natural 2000 European sites. The development of A46 will exacerbate all 5 threats which are:-
   1. Higher air pollution – excessive vehicle use and traffic fumes
   2. Human intrusion and disturbance due to lack of space around sensitive sites
   3. With increased numbers of dogs and cats
   4. There is no mention of a funding plan to protect any of these ancient sites
   5. There will be a fall out of species

8. Natural England states:- “Special Areas of conservation are European designated and are afforded protection under the conservation of habitats and species regulations 2010” Together with these 2 bodies and the green belt stipulations and original promises of the government to safeguard the green belt, there should be no question of even building further in this area.

9. Normandy has twisted, narrow roads. There are traffic concerns due to the increased number of vehicles should this gross development go ahead. We have a restricted railway bridge in Westwood lane, which only allows simple file traffic. Beech Lane has no sight line at all on exit to the North to go through the bridge. There would be bottlenecks at this junction and accidents and increased pollution. In glaziers lane the road over the railway has poor sightlines and an angled at approach from both directions which is another source of safety concern. The Christmas Pie crossroads which is on a bend exits at the top of a use has already seen many accidents over the years, yet nothing has been done to deal with the problem. The B3000 from wamborough Hill thorough Puttealam Heath Road towards Godalming is already at a standstill at peak times the accumulated traffic would exacerbate the problem and lead to excessive gridlocking and wasted journey time.

10. I object to the destruction of the green belt, to the views which Normandy and the surrounding countryside enjoys, all this will be sacrificed which is a travesty of planning law. Policy D4 states that new development within village will have particular regard to important views of the village from the Surrey Hills during daylight and at night due to the light pollution, which has already increased with the addition of street lights which were never there when we first arrived

11. The essential characteristics of the green belt all their openness and their pertinence! (NPPF) The proposed plans totally ignore this. GBC are ignoring past verdicts of planning inspectors who recognised the importance of their directions. Why is GBC ignoring them?

12. The following sites are being ignored which point to the special biodiversity in this area which will be fragmented and result in a loss of species. Wamborough and Normandy woods Site Nature Conservation importance (SNCI) A47. The paddocks (SNCI). GBC want to build on this site. The stream goes through it from the Hog’s Back and last year with the excessive rain we had to proposed land was under 3 foot of water this plot is a flood plain and should not be built on ever. Normandy Pond(SNCI) Normandy Common(SNCI) Wyke Churchyard(SNCI) – Flexford(SNCI) all these would be adversely affected by the building of the development proposed with lack of space for species to thrive. When we arrived here in 1968 there were swallows – I have not seen any in years, nor swifts or even the once common house sparrow has declined. Further declines is inevitable if we continue to sacrifice on countryside for urban sprawl

13. I object to any change in Normandy and Flexford’s green belt boundaries. There are brownfield sites available around Guildford which would eliminate the need for destroying the local green spaces, the less expensive as infrastructure is available of gas, electricity, drainage etc. The closer to all services and provide houses nearer to the centre of town. Other local authorities apply constraints to their housing numbers. GBC do not. This proposal does not assess the needs of Normandy’s residents and the 100% increase in the number of houses suggested will destroy our natural, rural environment. The case has not been made for this destruction.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object fundamentally to this developer led Plan in regard to Site 46 – Normandy/Flexford.

It should be very obvious under serious scrutiny that there is a total lack of supportive infrastructure.

The two Lanes forming part of the boundary of Site 46 – Westwood Lane/Wanborough Hill and Glaziers Lane - could in no way not cope with the substantial increase in traffic, and neither could the third boundary road – the A323 Guildford/Aldershot road – which is already heavily utilised. Any sensible person would immediately understand that it is completely impossible to envisage any "highways improvements" that would enable these narrow roads to cope.

Additionally, this is an environmentally sensitive location in close proximation to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area with many vitally important ecological networks and habitats.

The proposed development would destroy these and through the pollution generated – through light, litter, noise, diffuse land and road runoff - would without doubt negatively affect the known green infrastructure corridors, the ancient woodland, stream habitats, Normandy Common, Normandy Pond, and also Wyke Churchyard.

Historically, it is a well known fact that, the area is already prone to flooding. The proposed development would without doubt create a disaster at some stage.

This developer led Plan majors on an intimated need for a new secondary school for the western parishes. This is a completely incorrect assertion.

The schools serving the western parishes are currently well undersubscribed and there are apparently in excess of some 730 vacancies.

Additionally it is understood that the SCC has already approved expansions at the County School, Guildford and St. Peters.

Also in 2018, a new technical college is to open that will provide a further 480 places.

QED there is absolutely no need for the school on which the developer bases this proposed Plan.

In view of all the above facts this Plan should be rejected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3251 Respondent: 15443137 / Andy Clements Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object fundamentally to this developer led Plan in regard to Site 46 – Normandy/Flexford.

It should be very obvious under serious scrutiny that there is a total lack of supportive infrastructure.

The two Lanes forming part of the boundary of Site 46 – Westwood Lane/Wanborough Hill and Glaziers Lane - could in no way not cope with the substantial increase in traffic, and neither could the third boundary road – the A323 Guildford/Aldershot road – which is already heavily utilised. Any sensible person would immediately understand that it is completely impossible to envisage any "highways improvements" that would enable these narrow roads to cope.

Additionally, this is an environmentally sensitive location in close proximation to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area with many vitally important ecological networks and habitats.

The proposed development would destroy these and through the pollution generated – through light, litter, noise, diffuse land and road runoff - would without doubt negatively affect the known green infrastructure corridors, the ancient woodland, stream habitats, Normandy Common, Normandy Pond, and also Wyke Churchyard.

Historically, it is a well known fact that, the area is already prone to flooding. The proposed development would without doubt create a disaster at some stage.

This developer led Plan majors on an intimated need for a new secondary school for the western parishes. This is a completely incorrect assertion.

The schools serving the western parishes are currently well undersubscribed and there are apparently in excess of some 730 vacancies.

Additionally it is understood that the SCC has already approved expansions at the County School, Guildford and St. Peters.

Also in 2018, a new technical college is to open that will provide a further 480 places.

QED there is absolutely no need for the school on which the developer bases this proposed Plan.

In view of all the above facts this Plan should be rejected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Lastly in respect of Policy A46 there is nothing in the local plan which gives any evidence of 'exceptional circumstances' to justify the release of site A46 from the Green Belt. So why does there need to be development in this area instead of other locations around the borough?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3312  **Respondent:** 15447649 / Becky Woodcock  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I am a resident in Flexford (Normandy) and have recently been made aware of the new building plans that have been proposed for the lane in between Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane.

I fully object to these plans.

My main reason for objection is that there is absolutely no need for any schools in our area. Ash Manor School and Kings College are both undersubscribed, these schools should be aiming to get in more pupils. Why build a new school in the middle of both of these schools and have another undersubscribed one? After speaking to many of my neighbours, most of which have young children in between the ages of 5 and 13, none of them are pleased with the idea of the school. They didn’t choose to live in an area like Normandy because they knew it was going to have a new school built there. They moved there to be away from the hustle and bustle. Why build new homes on two roads called ‘Lane’? We have the traffic from the A31 and A3 to deal with already, and people cutting through Flexford to get to the Aldershot Road. The roads are unable to take the traffic. It’s unfair on the residents already living in the area, choosing to live here for peace and quiet from the big stores, schools and major traffic, to then be put in the middle of it all because of 1100 new homes.

In conclusion, I object to the proposal of new homes and a school in Normandy.

Thank you for your time.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3379  **Respondent:** 15449025 / Roger F Thomas  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I am writing to register my objection to the above proposals which will have an unacceptable impact on this community.

I hasten to add that I fully accept the need for additional local housing, but this should be of modest scale, defiantly not the concentration and number of houses in this proposal, that would double the size of the village and completely change the character of the village.
It is my understanding that the justification for the proposal to build on Green Belt land is linked to the building of a new secondly school. My understanding is that, quite apart from other practical objections there is no existing or anticipated need for addition school places in the Borough. In fact there are at least two undersubscribed local secondary schools that have expressed a willingness to expand should a future need arise.

Other practical objections are.

The proposed land is in the low point of the valley and is subject to flooding.

Both Glaziers and Westwood Lanes are already over used minor roads with dangerous bridges which are in effect rat runs off the A31, this would only become even more acute if this proposal was adopted.

School Lane is already a dangerous spot and the additional traffic and pressure on Wyke Primary school has not been considered.

The Guildford Road already is over load and this would only become more acute.

I don’t believe that the local services will cope with the magnitude of the proposed expansion. My home is already subject to interruptions in the electrical supply.

There is no planned provision for additional medical facilities, shops, pubs and facilities for young people.

I sincerely trust that this plan will not be taken forward which is clearly against the wishes and best interests of the existing local community.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3584</th>
<th>Respondent: 15449025 / Roger F Thomas</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am writing to register my objection to the above proposals which will have an unacceptable impact on this community.

I hasten to add that I fully accept the need for additional local housing, but this should be of modest scale, defiantly not the concentration and number of houses in this proposal, that would double the size of the village and completely change the character of the village.

It is my understanding that the justification for the proposal to build on Green Belt land is linked to the building of a new secondly school. My understanding is that, quite apart from other practical objections there is no existing or anticipated need for additional school places in the Borough. In fact there are at least two undersubscribed local secondary schools that have expressed a willingness to expand should a future need arise.

Other practical objections are:

The proposed land is in the low point of the valley and is subject to flooding.

Draft Local Plan in respect of Normandy and Flexford,

I am writing to register my objection to the above proposals which will have an unacceptable impact on this community.

I hasten to add that I fully accept the need for additional local housing, but this should be of modest scale, definitely not the concentration and number of houses in this proposal, that would double the size of the village and completely change the character of the village.

Draft Local Plan in respect of Normandy and Flexford,

I am writing to register my objection to the above proposals which will have an unacceptable impact on this community.

I hasten to add that I fully accept the need for additional local housing, but this should be of modest scale, definitely not the concentration and number of houses in this proposal, that would double the size of the village and completely change the character of the village.

Draft Local Plan in respect of Normandy and Flexford,
Both Glaziers and Westwood Lanes are already overused minor roads with dangerous bridges which are in effect rat runs off the A31, this would only become even more acute if this proposal was adopted.

School Lane is already a dangerous spot and the additional traffic and pressure on Wyke Primary school has not been considered.

The Guildford Road already is over load and this would only become more acute.

I don't believe that the local services will cope with the magnitude of the proposed expansion. My home is already subject to interruptions in the electrical supply.

There is no planned provision for additional medical facilities, shops, pubs and facilities for young people.

I sincerely trust that this plan will not be taken forward which is clearly against the wishes and best interests of the existing local community.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: 

---

Dear Sir/Madam

As a local resident I would like to strongly object to the proposed destruction of our Green Belt countryside at Normandy in Surrey to build 1100 homes and a school. (please see the attached pictures of the proposed site). The planning proposal is not only totally disproportional to the surrounding countryside and village but it’s also proposed on Green Belt agricultural, grazing land and not safeguarded land as you claim.

The local schools, in Guildford, are only 43% full so have a surplus of 57% so this school will be a folly to get the planning granted!

Guildford Borough Council claim they respect the British countryside (see the link below) yet they are planning to build an 1100 unit housing estate and school on Green belt fields.

http://www.surreyhills.org/discover/ (Please see the map)

The village roads are not suited to the vast amount of traffic that 1100 homes will produce, averaging of 2000 extra cars on roads that are not fit for purpose some of which have a single lane pass through (under a railway bridge), low level lighting and no pavements. This would cost the council a considerable amount to make safe for the increase in residents, not to mention the fact that the land and village are prone to flooding.

Don’t turn our beautiful village surrounded by countryside into a town. There are other proposed sites closer to Guildford at Blackwell farm which would make a far more suitable site for a new school.

I grew up in Feltham, Middlesex and have worked hard all my life to pay my mortgage so that I could move from a built up area to the country, please don’t punish those who have never taken anything from the system, by building what they moved away from in their back yards!

Sustainable agricultural land is being sacrificed for a concrete mess which will have a devastating impact on wildlife with many species of wild bird & mammals (dragonflies, smooth snakes, woodlarks & nightjars etc) having their habitat torn...
apart forever including the destruction numerous beautiful indigenous oak trees which are hundreds of years old and could never be replaced.

I ask you the simple question “would you want this development in your street”?

We have all been blessed with nature on our doorsteps, as you know, so we need to embrace it & protect it as if these open fields get ripped away it will never, ever be replaced.

I beg you to save our countryside for ourselves and our children’s children instead of building this terrible legacy which no one could be remotely proud of.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: 20160626_111137_resized.jpg (1.7 MB)  picture.jpg (1.7 MB)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3434  Respondent: 15450049 / Michael Bedford  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to strongly object to the A46 proposal for 1100 homes, secondary school, retail units, shops and showman pitches etc.

I cannot believe the sheer scale of such a development, which will destroy the community and rural environment. Normandy and Flexford are within Green Belt Land and the development is a threat to the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area.

A school for 1500 pupils is not needed in our area, as there are over 700 places available to the west of the Borough. There are nearly 500 places available at the new Technical College and I believe there are approved expansions at Guildford County and St Peters. The traffic chaos that will be caused by such a huge development, particularly around school commuting times is just unbearable. Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane will become gridlocked and many of us will be trapped, not able to get to important appointments without having to factor in an enormous amount of additional travelling time. The Guildford Road already gets backed up into Normandy up to the traffic lights at Aldershot Road, and also Wanborough Hill has long tailbacks in the morning commute. Add the additional amount of traffic caused by school pick ups and drop offs and it will be a total disaster. I dread to think about the amount of cars parked all over the village, to add to the frustration for the Normandy and Flexford residents, and I haven’t even touched on the subject of noise and environmental pollution.

It is truly shocking that a development of this size is being considered within the Greenbelt, and the important views of the village from the Hogs Bank AONB will be destroyed. The characteristics of the Green Belt are their openness and their permanence, which are being totally ignored. There are plenty of brownfield sites which should be used, before devastating the Green Belt areas of The Surrey Hills and The Hogs Back. I believe there are only 2,700 homes planned in Guildford Town Centre, not that many more than what is being proposed for our small villages of Normandy and Flexford.

100% increase in the number of dwellings in Normandy will destroy our rural environment. I only moved out of Guildford to Normandy 3 years ago, to live a more sedate and quiet life. At no stage when my search was going through, was there mention of a development on this scale. It has come to light that at least 2 years ago Taylor Wimpey submitted their plan. No decent efforts seem to have been made to consult with the local people until now.

I will be truly saddened and will probably have to sell my home, if the madness of this proposal is approved. It’s not needed. None of the villagers want this scale of development. None of us want or need the school, indeed it is proved
that this is not necessary. None of us want the traffic and parking chaos that will ensue. None of us want to be blocked in our homes and none of us want our beautiful and peaceful village, turned into a town.

Please, reconsider this proposal and keep our beautiful village just the way it is.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3486  Respondent: 15451233 / Peter Older  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to inform Guildford Borough Council that I object most strongly to the proposed plans for development of the GREEN BELT LAND (Site A46) at Normandy.

This village has already been subject to an enforced housing estate (also built on GREEN BELT LAND) at The Paddocks, I believe that the original intention by the building consortium then (TAYLOR Woodrow) was to build 52 town houses but it was considered to be inappropriate and a mixture of private houses and council-owned bungalows was eventually approved.

We now face another similarly, but much larger, inappropriate proposal by a related consortium (TAYLOR Wimpey) whose sole intention appears to be to increase its profits with little regard to the requirements of the village population.

I am very dismayed about the apparent lack of concern by those responsible for even considering this proposal as it will not only seriously impact on the existing wildlife and footpaths locally, but also to the risk of serious flooding to the whole village.

The traffic situation at Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane is already at very high levels during peak hours and it will be seriously compounded if this proposed development goes ahead. The two narrow railway bridges already cause concern at present and would become even more dangerous with a significant increase in the resulting traffic situation.

Furthermore, I cannot comprehend the reason for the proposed school in this area considering that the nearest existing schools in either direction are undersubscribed.

I have lived in Normandy for 44 years and during that time the village has lost many business premises which have been replaced by housing which I have never objected to because that is progress, and I am not one to stand in the way of progress. However, I object to this current application because I consider that it is certainly not progress, it is greed and it is irresponsible and it should be stopped immediately.

There is little doubt in my mind that those responsible for this proposed project do not live in the village, have no intention of ever doing so, and therefore have little regard for the existing residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3706  Respondent: 15453889 / Teresa Van Den Bosch  Agent:
I support the removal of site A46-1,100 homes and school (land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford) and removal of site A47-50 homes (land to the east of the Paddocks, Flexford)

which is in Green Belt land and would overwhelm the local infrastructure, especially roads and healthcare and put extra pressure on the electricity supply, sewage and waste water services and increase vulnerability to flooding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

We very strongly object to building on Green Belt Land
We strongly object to plan A46, the proposed housing development in Normandy/Flexford
We also strongly object to large scale housing developments in Normandy
We object to the construction of a new large school in view of the fact that schools in the area are under-subscribed
We object to our rural environment being destroyed
We also object to this proposal as it will greatly affect views, wildlife, flooding, and local infrastructure will not be able to cope with this scale of development. Therefore, the needs of Normandy/Flexford residents are being undermined.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Destruction of green belt in Normandy, Flexford and Wanborough.

It appears that meetings have been going on for a number of years with the developer and the council, but without the knowledge of the people living in these villages. The same developer (then called Taylor Woodrow) developed another green belt site in Normandy some 35 years ago when a development was approved because the developer "donated" six old peoples' bungalows to Normandy Parish.

Please do not allow the destruction of further green belt, when there are brownfield sites which could take one million
Traffic hazards

The bridge over the railway in Glaziers Lane is not strong enough or wide enough to support the additional weight of traffic. The bridge is very narrow and there are daily "near-misses" as traffic straddles the white line at speed. There has been a fatality on the crossroads of Glaziers Lane and Guildford Road.

The bridge under the railway in Westwood Lane has a one-lane pass through. There have been fatalities at this bridge.

Wanborough Hill would not be able to cope with traffic from a large development which would affect the traffic flow onto the A31 which already has numerous accidents/delays in rush hours when traffic diverts through Normandy and causes traffic chaos.

Commercial vehicles

Large lorries already cause damage in Glaziers Lane when delivering to commercial properties. Should a development be allowed to take place, this lane would be used for all delivery lorries as Westwood Lane has a low-level bridge which could not take such vehicles.

A sink hole has already opened up on two or three occasions close to the junction of Glaziers Lane/Guildford Road.

Flooding

Houses in Glaziers Lane experience severe flooding problems. The loss of farmland and woodland and increased paved areas would only increase the seriousness of the flooding. Only yesterday, some gardens in Glaziers Lane became flooded due to rain.

School

Two other secondary schools in the area are under-subscribed. I question the need for another school. Also, the traffic from a 1,500 pupil school would cause traffic havoc, such as that experienced every morning rush hour on the Worplesdon Road, Guildford, from the Elizabeth Park housing development.

Health and safety

Children would be at risk of serious injury if a site housing fairground equipment was located close to a school. There is presently a large acreage of land in Normandy named "Whittles Drive", Guildford Road, Guildford, which houses a great deal of fairground equipment. There is no need for further storage.

Destruction of wildlife

Destruction of hedges/trees and habitats reduces the availability of food, shelter, nesting sites, etc. for our wildlife which are under increasing pressure. A large proportion of Normandy contains part of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. We need to protect all sites of special scientific interest. This can never be replaced.

Thank you for taking your time to read this email and please take into consideration all of my comments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Normandy/Flexford cannot cope with the number of proposed houses in the plan. It also does not need a secondary school here. In fact as I understand it, there are still spaces in a lot of the west Guildford secondary schools going spare so would like to see proper evidence of this requirement.

The drainage system and the roads cannot support that many more houses and are already struggling with what it has to cope with now.

On top of this it would ruin the area of natural beauty currently in existence and affect local wildlife (both on the site itself and nearby due to increased volume of walkers / pets) when there are much better brownfield sites that could be used. Or a larger number of smaller developments would also make more sense than such vast ones in tiny villages that do not have capacity to cope with the increases proposed. For example I understand there is a fairly obvious site in West Horsley that would be suitable for a slightly smaller development and Normandy/Flexford could certainly accommodate some new homes (and possibly some retail) but just not nearly as many as are being proposed and certainly no secondary school.

Having recently moved to the area for it's small parish feel and beautiful surroundings, I sincerely hope that you take these comments on board and reconsider your approach.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3703  **Respondent:** 15456705 / M Wicks  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I WOULD LIKE TO ADD MY OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED A46 DEVELOPMENT IN NORMANDY AND FLEXFORD.

As a long term resident of the part of Ash which comes under the boundaries of Normandy Parish, I have attended the public meetings and have read the literature published and I strongly believe that Guildford Borough Council should not allow the development to go ahead due to a number of reasons.

**GREEN BELT LAND**

The proposed development being an inappropriate use of a rural area. This land is designated as Green Belt land, the fundamental aim of Green Belt Policy being to prevent the unrestricted urban sprawl by keeping land 'permanently' open. It is part of the essential and important divide between Guildford and Rushmoor Boroughs, and the ever enlarging Guildford and Aldershot urbanisation and their respective areas. Developments on green fields not only add to creeping suburbanisation but once change of use has taken place, the decision can never be reversed and that particular part of the rural environment is destroyed and lost forever. I question why more attention cannot be paid to the development or brownbelt or brown field sites, which in some cases have some or all of the services in place and so in the long term could be less expensive to develop. Local Authorities are required to have a register of brownfield land so sites that can be recycled, regenerated and put back into use. Places on the Guildford list include Woodbridge Meadows, Walnut Tree Close by the station area and North Street, however I do feel if further research were carried out appropriate further development sites could be found with less of a need to take virgin Green Belt Land. Also why cannot better utilisation be made of unused sites within the urbanised areas of Guildford itself and its surrounding areas particularly when apparently
There is a desperate requirement for housing in central Guildford itself? Why is there a need to locate new properties on the edge of the Borough and how can the Council justify releasing precious Green Belt Land to be lost forever?

**Natural Flood Plains**

I have owned my property for over forty years and over that time have become fully aware of the importance of maintaining the natural flood plains due to excessive rainfall during particular years and in particular areas. From what I have learned I feel that Guildford Borough Council have not completely considered the implications of water stress upon this Green Land. Their Surface Water Management Plan has excluded the land north of A46, yet flood risk 3a and 3b is identified on the Environmental Agencies flood risk map. Loss of, or the development on, of an effective flood plain would severely impact on the surrounding areas, putting not only any newly developed properties at risk, but more importantly and most unfairly, existing properties. Time and again I have personally witnessed the results of heavy rainfall on land down between the higher ground of the Hogs Back and the adjacent army land and one feature is highlighted. The current land for floodplain and the drainage services find it hard to cope in containing and draining away the water. New mass development of the land will surely only add to this problem.

**Proposed Amount of Building**

I find the number and type of properties proposed to be built in the village of Normandy to be disproportionate and in certain cases unjustified. I am well aware that the Government sets quotas and guidelines for our Councils to follow, however the impact of 1100 houses on a village such as Normandy has the possibility of totally changing the place, socially, environmentally and economically. More concerning than the development of habitations are the proposed plans for a school. I learn that apparently Secondary schools to the West of the Borough are currently undersubscribed by a significant number so question why a school should be needed. The reason given is that educational provision planned is because of the need arising from the allocation of development on this site, so the argument again turns to that if the development were not taking place then the school would not be needed. On a similar vein there is also the proposed parade of shops on the new development. Due to the nature of how residents access and use local amenities, shops and pubs have had to close in the recent years because they became no longer economically viable. Again then I question why are decisions regarding services for the public being taken without consultation with the local population to find out the actual realistic need for the area?

**Roads and Traffic**

I do strongly believe that the Green Belt is already being eroded by disproportionate ‘strategic sites’ particularly as they do not always have the secured funding for infrastructure and road improvements. Normandy is a predominantly rural area and the transportation of residents accessing shops and amenities in the local areas is in the majority of cases by private vehicles. The level of traffic on the local roads in and around Normandy is already well above the capacity these roads were designed for, the main road through the village being an ‘A’ road and main artery between Guildford and Aldershot. The situation at the moment though is that this road is only single carriage either way and thus any minor incidents such as horse riders, vehicles parked on the side of the road, delivery vehicles, the beginning and end of the school day, etc., already have the capacity to bring traffic to a complete stand still during certain times of busy flow. There does appear to be no evidence of secure funding for any major improvements to the roads passing through or around Normandy. The not unjustifiably expected and drastic increase of motor vehicles introduced from such a comparatively small area onto the existing network then will only add to the causation of grid-lock, stagnation of the local economy and massively increased exhaust pollution.

Having lake into consideration the above factors. I cannot conceivably see how the proposed plans can be legally compliant with planning policies set for local authority areas. Not only do they not fully meet the legal requirements of the relevant Planning Acts and Regulations, but their implementation could bring long term and lasting, severe and detrimental effects to the area, affecting it environmentally, socially and economically.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**GBC Draft Local Plan re Normandy & Frexford Site A46**

This is to register my very strong **OBJECTION** to the building plans for the Normandy and Flexford site A46.

For the following reasons:-

1. **THE SCHOOL.**

I object most strongly to the proposal to build a secondary school. By no stretch of the imagination is this school necessary. There is proven spare capacity in other local schools and the opportunity to expand some of them if necessary. The proposal to build this school is clearly the developers ‘carrot’ to enable them to get permission for the rest of the plan.

1. **TRAFFIC.**

I object to the fact that no thought seems to have been given to the chaos the additional traffic would cause. The whole area would be in total gridlock morning and afternoon. It can take the best part of an hour now, to travel the few miles into Guildford in the morning. There is clearly no way in which these country roads could be improved to accommodate the extra traffic in and out of the village.

1. **GREEN BELT.**

This is Green Belt land and should remain so. There would be no reason to sacrifice it if ‘brown field’ sites in Guildford were used for homes instead of endless new retail outlets. If more consideration was given to building accommodation in Guildford it would avoid the congestion and pollution caused by countless car journeys into the town.

1. **NEED.**

It is not a proven fact that we need this many new homes in the Guildford area.

How was this figure arrived at?

1. a) Part of the suggested need is due to student requirements. If accommodation was built on campus the students at the University would not have to travel from elsewhere.

1. b) Most of the villages around Guildford could accommodate a realistic building plan off up to a total of 10% increase over the time of the plan. This would be accomplished without ruining any of the villages.

1. **WILDLIFE.**

I object to the fact that no attention is being paid to the various government directives regarding the effect a building plan will have on the local wildlife. One of the considerations is the close proximity to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. These appear to be being completely ignored. This size of the proposed development would have a huge impact.

1. **LEGALITY.**

There is a question of the legal aspect of the whole plan. There doesn’t seem to be any exceptional circumstances to justify the removal of Normandy and Flexford from washed over green belt status.

1. **CONSULTATION.**

Certainly there has been no consultation with Normandy residents (which I believe government guidelines advocate.) Most of us have chosen to live here for its rural location. Our shops and Pub closed through lack of use, and although it
would be nice to have these amenities, not at the price of this developer-led overdevelopment. Our lives will certainly not be improved by this plan.

Finally, how can it be reasonable to almost double the number of homes in this village? The area will be completely ruined and just be a dormitory town for Guildford, instead of part of a green buffer between Guildford and Aldershot.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7894  Respondent: 15460737 / Donna Collinson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

See comments on questions 1 to 3

See Appendix 4

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3784  Respondent: 15460769 / Jonathan Gasson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As a resident of Normandy I strongly appose the proposal within GBC the local plan to develop this site A46 for 1100 house and a new secondary school.

This area of land is greenbelt and looking at the local plan no circumstances what so ever have been identified to justify the release of the site of A46rom the Green belt.

The need fro a new school arising with the development and to support the local area has not been proven , local schools are not currently full. If the site is not allocated for housing the need for a school can not be justified .

The proposed development would completely destroy the rural nature of Normandy doubling the number of resident's and just create another extension of Guildford to the east and Aldershot to the west.

On road infrastructure alone this proposal is not sustainable with only C class roads surround the immediate boundary of the the site . The local roads are at present traffic levels are extremely busy and congested at peak times , Any small incident or planned road works courses long tail backs of traffic on the main Guildford to Aldershot Road and the Pirbright Road, especially if traffic is diverted off the hogs back through Wanborough and Normandy. The road surface is deteriorating up in many paces and this will only get worse with another 2000 plus cars using the local roads on a daily basis.

Normandy is rural area with important natural habit and is immediately adjacent to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. Any develop will have asignificant effect on the SPA. With added visitor pressure. The case for the provision of SANGS sites has not as yet be proven for the protection of the SPA.
Brown field sites within the Borough should be used wisely for Housing rather than more retail outlets. Surely the need for housing is the greater priority.

This proposal needs to be rejected now.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8271  Respondent: 15460801 / Melanie Williams  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site A46 Land to South of Normandy and North of Flexford: Mixed used Development 1100

-

I strongly object to the inclusion of this site within the plan for these reasons:

In my opinion the classification of the two roads that border site A46, Westward Lane and Glaziers Lane, are ill equipped to service a development of this size and the additional traffic. Westwood Lane reduces to a single lane carriageway underneath the railway bridge and Glaziers Lane, a lower classification road than the former is narrower with residential garden boundaries bordering the carriageway. It would seem that the plan hasn't considered a viable transport strategy to implement a development of this scale. As a resident who commutes daily to Walton-on-Thames, I am aware of the already significant traffic congestion within the village at peak times. These two roads are currently roads used to capacity as alternative routes to/from the A3 and as rat runs to/from the Hogs Back, especially when there is a travel incident in Guildford or on the A3 (which is frequent!).

If the development is considered based on the village being served by a railway station, then this service would be immediately be over-stretched. To double the size of the village would be to potentially double the amount of people using the transport links. Wanborough is a small station with a short platform. The railway station car park has only 8 spaces and there is no scope to provide more. It is surrounded by houses and a roofing business thus not making it conducive to expansion without further investment of developing the field North of the line. The current car park floods terribly whenever it rains and you need wellington boots to access the platforms. This coupled with the lack of parking spaces already forces commuters to park in Culls Road and The Paddocks, so where would additional users of the station park?

Normandy already suffers with low water pressure, how will the usage of another 1100 homes help this?

There is already a significant burden on our Doctors Surgery in Glaziers Lane. You can't currently obtain a bookable appointment for much less than 4 weeks in advance, therefore you are often forced to request an emergency appointment as your healthcare needs become more urgent in this time-frame. I do not see how an increase to the size of the village can improve this situation. Has there been any provision for further healthcare needs of the proposed additional community?

Historically, the land is agricultural. The Greenbelt is for everyone's benefit. There are Grade 2 listed properties backing onto this site and surely this is part of our heritage that we should be working to preserve. Guildford Borough Council is keen to showcase its history, however, this should not be exclusively retained in a museum or in the town centre. We should be proud to see it in our villages and secure its place in our future.
The light pollution of the proposed development would affect the view from the Surrey Hills and have a lasting effect on the ecology of Normandy - less than 5kms from the Thames Heath Basin's Special Protection Area, with many wildlife species that use it, as listed above.

The current plan treats Normandy and Flexford as two separate settlements for the purposes of the greenbelt, however, they are one and the same and gives false suggestion; for which I can only presume is beneficial to planning. I cannot see a logical reason for including this development in the draft plan, only for it to serve the council. Dealing with one developer on a scale such as this would ultimately incur less resource than managing many smaller ones. Is Normandy now to suffer for Guildford Borough Council's shortcomings for not providing adequate housing previously?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3809  Respondent: 15461377 / Elizabeth Evenden  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy number A46 – the development between Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane.

- The development is planned on green belt land and will involve losing valuable green belt, within a kilometer of the protected Hogs Back area. This land is essential to local wildlife’s ecosystem, and also to the quality of life and air experienced by local residents.

- The development will create additional traffic on roads which are already strained to their limit. Guildford Road is already heavily congested at certain times of the day and the addition of 1100 new homes is likely to bring in upwards of 1500 vehicles, each of which will add to this congestion.

- The railway bridge on Westwood Lane is unsuitable for these traffic volumes. It’s a single lane bridge and the additional traffic is likely to create holdups at the bridge and therefore an increase in pollution for local residents.

- The addition of 1100 homes to the community already in place will more than double it in size. This will have a profound negative impact on the peace, quiet and quality of life for people within the immediate vicinity and will also impact on those of us living with the environs of the new development.

- Inadequate consultation. This development has not previously been mentioned in the Guildford Borough Local Plan drafts, and I do not believe there has been sufficient consultation with local people and businesses in order to assess the likely impact of the development.

I would ask that the Council, on consideration of these views, not proceed with the plans and instead look elsewhere to site these homes, if they are required. At the very least I request that the size and scale of the development be reduced to a level more fitting with the rural environment into which it is being placed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3879  Respondent: 15462529 / Andrew Baxter  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

I object to Policy number A46 – the development between Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane.

- The development is planned on green belt land and will involve losing valuable green belt, within a kilometer of the protected Hogs Back area. This land is essential to local wildlife’s ecosystem, and also to the quality of life and air experienced by local residents.

- The development will create additional traffic on roads which are already strained to their limit. Guildford Road is already heavily congested at certain times of the day and the addition of 1100 new homes is likely to bring in upwards of 1500 vehicles, each of which will add to this congestion.

- The railway bridge on Westwood Lane is unsuitable for these traffic volumes. It’s a single lane bridge and the additional traffic is likely to create holdups at the bridge and therefore an increase in pollution for local residents.

- The addition of 1100 homes to the community already in place will more than double it in size. This will have a profound negative impact on the peace, quiet and quality of life for people within the immediate vicinity and will also impact on those of us living with the environs of the new development.

- Inadequate consultation. This development has not previously been mentioned in the Guildford Borough Local Plan drafts, and I do not believe there has been sufficient consultation with local people and businesses in order to assess the likely impact of the development.

I would ask that the Council, on consideration of these views, not proceed with the plans and instead look elsewhere to site these homes, if they are required. At the very least I request that the size and scale of the development be reduced to a level more fitting with the rural environment into which it is being placed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
GBC Local Plan affecting Normandy

I object to the development proposed for Normandy for the following reasons:

1. the land is designated greenbelt and the proposed development of 1100 houses is out of proportion to the existing village;
2. there is no demonstrated need for school provision, and therefore this cannot be used as justification for new housing;
3. the existing road network is already stretched and full at times, and has no capacity to absorb the large additional demand the development would produce.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4254 Respondent: 15479201 / Nick Norton Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A46.

This land is located with land parcel H12 as identified in GBCS Vol IV. The land is DEFRA agricultural land Grade 3A and has been farmed traditionally for pasture (sheep and cattle) and for grain (wheat and barley) in perpetuity. The land contains many stands of scheduled Ancient Woodland. The land contributes to the ‘openness’ of the Green Belt between the settlements of Flexford and Normandy and should remain ‘washed over’ by the Green Belt.

Legal Precedent

I object to the removal of the land allocated to Policy A46 by removal from the Green Belt by “inset” under NPPF para 83 and 84.

The “exceptional circumstances” required to redraw the Green Belt boundary for the land in Policy A46, appear nowhere in the Local Plan of so how can I judge this proposal?

In the Gallagher Homes Ltd v Solihull Borough Council [2014] EWHC 1283 (Admin), Hickinbottom J decision in particular lays out:

“Exceptional circumstances are required for any revision of the boundary, whether the proposal isto extend or diminish the Green Belt. That is the ratio of Carpets of Worth.

Whilst each case is fact-sensitive and the question of whether circumstances are exceptional for these purposes requires an exercise of planning judgment, what is capable of amounting to exceptional circumstances is a matter of law, and a plan-maker may err in law if he fails to adopt a lawful approach to exceptional circumstances. Once a Green Belt has been established and approved, it requires more than general planning concepts to justify an alteration.”

Without the “exceptional circumstances” included in the proposals for this Policy it appears unsound.

Guildford Borough Settlement Profiles (July 2013) & Settlement Hierarchy (May 2014)
I object to the use of a 2010 survey of parishes that was not represented to parish councils as to be part of the Local Plan evidence base in an attempt to present the two settlements as one in the Settlement Profile document. It is recognised in the Settlement Hierarchy that Flexford and Normandy are separate settlements, neither rank highly based on their individual sets of community facilities and services (Normandy 13, Flexford 27 sustainability ranking in Settlement Hierarchy report).

There is no traditional community centre. The ward contains five hamlets in a dispersed area. It is disingenuous to represent Flexford and Normandy as a combined community.

The incorrect assessment in the Settlement Profile document has been pointed out under Regulation 18 consultation but the council continues to include this flawed document as evidence.

It should be discounted and removed from the evidence base.

Use of educational provision as “exceptional circumstances”

I object to the proposed site of Normandy/Flexford (Policy A46) for a new Secondary School; this should be rejected as the need for such a school in the location has not been proven. GBC in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, May2016 indicate that SED 3, IDP p87, a 7-form entry (7FE) secondary school at the Normandy / Flexford strategic development site, requires only 1 FE to serve the development site itself, the remaining capacity would serve the wider area, including Blackwell Farm site (Policy A26). However, given that the proposed Blackwell Farm development is for 1,800 dwellings, on a pro-rated basis of children of secondary school age within the arising population, this would only require a maximum of 2FE. Together, the Blackwell Farm site and the Normandy/Flexford site require only an estimated 3 FE provision. The proposed school is excessive in size, being more than twice as large (7FE) as the estimated need (3FE), and as other information provided here indicates, this is well within the funding and expansion capabilities of existing schools in the western wards of Guildford borough and the western side of the town. Every neighbouring secondary school is currently undersubscribed, Kings Manor in particular with 57% of its school places currently unoccupied.

SCC Education Officers need to demonstrate a clear need for such a school at this, given the current under-subscription of all the neighbouring secondary schools in the western wards of Guildford borough. There are currently 736 vacancies at the nearest secondary schools serving the western wards - not accounting for the 480 extra at the new Technical College to open in 2018 - a combined capacity of 1,216. In addition to those, SCC has already approved expansions at the County School, Guildford and St Peters.

Adding forms of entry to several existing schools will see the costs absorbed after the initial capital cost needed to create a few extra rooms and they still only require one headteacher, one set of staff etc. The Head Teacher and Chairman of Governors at Ash Manor School have offered to cooperate with a programme to expand that school, as had the Principal at Kings; if it needs expansion in the future there is space and a willingness to do so.

Contribution to the Purposes of the Green Belt

I object to the overriding of the contribution the land proposed for Policy A46 makes to the 5 purposes of the Green Belt in response to a developer-led proposal for large-scale house building in the Green Belt in Policy A46.

Guildford Borough Council recognises the contribution the land surrounding and within the settlements of Normandy and Flexford makes to the five purposes of the Green Belt in identifying land parcels H10, H12, H13, H14, H15, H16, J16 and J17 of particular sensitivity in its reevaluation of the land parcels in the Green Belt & Countryside Study, Vol 2 Addendum, Appendix 1 and 2, reinforcing the evaluation in GBCS Vol 1. The evaluation of the ‘land parcels’ is laid out in the tables in GBCS Vol 4. The ‘land parcel’ that contains the land proposed for Policy A46 is H12, evaluated against 4 purposes of the Green belt it performs as follows:

- Checks sprawl of Normandy and Flexford
- Prevents Flexford and Normandy from merging
- Assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
All of this is then ignored in the rush by GBC to appease Taylor Wimpey in order to affirm another strategic housing site and hold its hands up as if to say “not us Guv, its wos the developer that done it”.

Contribution to ‘openness’ of the Green Belt

I object to the rejection by GBC that the land proposed for Policy A46 fails to contribute to the “openness” of the Green Belt.

In the case of Normandy and Flexford, there have been two planning appeals concerning Gypsy pitches (Palm House Nurseries and Green Lane East) where the inspector agreed that land near Flexford and land to the west of Glaziers Lane exhibited ‘openness’. The inspector found in favour of the appellant on other grounds but the opinion on ‘openness’ in those judgements is evidence that the land around Normandy and Flexford is considered by the Planning Inspectorate to exhibit ‘openness’. A third more recent decision at appeal for housing development at North Wyke Farm found that the land contributed to the ‘openness’ of the Green Belt.

- Palm House Nurseries GBC 09/P/01851, Application 12 November 2009 Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/A/10/2131590 Decision 24 Feb 2011
- Green Lane East GBC 10/P/00507, Application 8 March 2010 Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/A/10/2140630 Decision 14 June 2011
- North Wyke Farm GBC 14/P/00779, Application 17 April 2014 Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/W/15/3002308 Decision date: 14 July 2015

I believe this indicates that PINS inspectors recognise the “openness” of the land around the two settlements of Normandy and Flexford and their contribution to the “openness” of the Green Belt.

Impact on Surrey Hills AONB

I believe both settlements should remain ‘washed over’ by the Green Belt as stated in NPPF para.86 “If it is necessary to prevent development in a village primarily because of the important contribution which the open character of the village makes to the openness of the Green Belt, the village should be included in the Green Belt”.

The land designated as AGLV and identified as 12-1 in the Map AONB Boundary Review - Recommended Areas for Consideration and pp28-29 AONB Area of Search Evaluation - Natural Beauty Evaluation, Oct 2013 report to be added to the Surrey Hills AONB, reinforces the proximity of valued landscape as it will add the north slopes of the Hogs Back overlooking Flexford settlement to the very boundary of Flexford settlement at Flexford Road.

Further, the land allocated in Policy A46 contains unrestricted view of the Hogs Back, part of the Surrey Hills AONB. Recent case law establishes that views out from open land to an AONB are as important as views into land overlooked by an AONB. Surrey Hills Management Board (of which GBC is a member) has submitted proposals to Natural England for land currently with local designation Area of Great Landscape Value on the north slopes of the Hogs Back above Wanborough and stretching down to Flexford Road at the southern boundary of Flexford settlement to be subsumed into the AONB and is currently awaiting agreement for inclusion.

The future potential presence of in excess of 1,000 houses visible at the periphery of the AONB with associated urbanising infrastructure (e.g. roads, perpetual street lighting, general light pollution, loss of ancient hedges and trees etc.) would do great harm to the views into the AONB from the land between Normandy and Flexford and from the Surrey Hills AONB. There will be significant light pollution in winter months.

Thames Basin Heaths SPA

I object to the assertion in Policy P5 that the creation of SANG will protect the rare ground-nesting bird species on this SSSI and Natura 2000 site from major disturbance and predation introduced by the building of 1,100 dwellings that give
rise to hundreds of adults and children, vehicles, dogs and cats within 1 kilometre of this internationally important wildlife habitat.

The 2012/13 visitor survey report commissioned by Natural England on behalf of the Thames Basin Heaths Joint Strategic Partnership Board showed not a static or falling number but a 10% increase in visitor numbers since 2005:

- 66% cited dog walking as the main activity
- 80% of interviewed groups had dogs
- 67% of interviewed groups had dogs which were seen off lead
- 39% specifically visited the SPA site because it was ‘close to home’
- the average distance travelled was just over 2.5 kilometres (80% by car)

Only 1% of visitors accessed the TBHSPA from the Normandy/Flexford direction, so the additional disturbance caused by the building and then occupation of 1,100 homes by 2,000-3,000 residents and 1,250 additional vehicles will be significant. Importantly, the prevalence of dog walking in the visitor survey suggests that the currently available SANG in the borough is ineffective in attracting those wishing to exercise dogs away from the TBHSPA.

Simply claiming that the 2012 visitor study data indicates success of the avoidance strategy in drawing people away from the SPA is no evidence at all. Where is data based on measurement of visitor numbers to the available SANG within Guildford borough? Where is the evidence that SANG or SAMM programmes have any impact on the behaviour of residents that are dog owners? Without it, a planning inspector has no means of finding the proposal of large-scale housebuilding at these sites sound. Natural England have admitted that no survey evidence exists of the effectiveness of SANG or SAMM programmes in directing dog-walkers away from TBHSPA in Guildford borough or any of the surrounding local authorities.

Creating 1,100 homes on Green Belt land between the settlements of Normandy & Flexford implies, on average, 340 dogs and nearly 290 cats (based on a survey of households carried out by a veterinary team at Bristol University in 2010 “Number and ownership profiles of cats and dogs in the UK” published in the Journal of The British Veterinary Association indicates 31% households own dogs and 26% households own cats); all housing to be located within 1 kilometre of the SSSI; for a dog owner, a 2-minute drive or 10 minute walk away. The survey showed dogs were more likely to be owned by rural households.

The proposed SANG schedule in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, May 2016 (IDP, SANG 13 p84) gives indication of neither the physical size nor location of bespoke SANG for Policy A46 (LAA Site 368); it is estimated that this proposed open space will be unable to cater adequately for 340 additional dogs plus their accompanying owners and there will be significant ‘leakage’ onto the TBHSPA.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become even more biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4386  Respondent: 15482913 / Calum Owen  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Please see attached letter regarding my objection to the proposed Normandy/Flexford development.

I hope for GBC to commit to not undertaking the development to preserve the valuable Green Belt land and more equitably share development throughout the area.

I would like to strongly display my objections to the proposed development on the land South of Normandy and of that North of Flexford, which has been indicated as the site of potentially substantial development.

Reasons for objection:

- The site lies within the Green Belt area and has been previously indicated as being highly sensitive in previous assessments, playing host to a variety of wildlife and in line with the purpose of Green Belt land should be preserved to prevent further encroachment of the urban sprawl.
- The development does not particularly fill any sustainability criteria, both environmentally and socially in line with that defined within policy frameworks.
- The area identified has not been subject to any indication of how the highways, railway and other infrastructure would be impacted. The significant scale of the proposed development indicates all infrastructure, transport and inclusive of drainage would be unable to cope, with little indication of improvements being provided that wouldn’t further affect the lack of sustainability this proposed development promises.
- The site was previously safeguarded providing no opportunity for discussion beforehand, displaying the value of this green belt land. The council has now failed to identify the value of this land and the opinion of the residents before proposing such a large scale development.
- The argument regarding the need for a school is circular, having little solid basis, other schools within the area are undersubscribed and there are a number of alternative sites and situations to solve the issues with a school which do not pose the problem of remoteness nor affect the green belt.
- The requirement for this development and housing is not based on the required exceptional circumstances to comply with policy and legislation required to develop Green Belt land with what appears to be wholly unsuitable and lacking evidence as to the true need of the school and housing.

Guildford Borough Council has seemingly proposed this development for its own ease having little regard for other factors. Manageable development is required within this area and there are a number of sites which would likely be more suitable. The sharing of disruption, pressure on infrastructure through mixed development throughout the whole of GBC area would be a much greater reflection of demand and would provide a more effective, sustainable and holistically economically viable options.

I feel there is a lack of sound justification or understanding regarding this development and strongly object to the design, scale and location of this proposed development. I hope to hear the confirmation from GBC that this development will not
be undertaken and so to preserve the vital green belt land, maintain some of the character of the area and allow for more sustainable development throughout the GBC area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  Development Objection Letter (2).docx  (23 KB)

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4423  Respondent: 15484065 / Ray & Carol Chong  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As residents of Normandy we would like to register our OBJECTION to the development of the Normandy & Flexford strategic site for the following reasons:

1. This land is greenbelt and maintaining this is vital to the rural area in which it sits. Normandy is on the slopes of the Hogs Back and views from the Surrey Hills would be drastically affected by the A46 development and would add to further urban sprawl in the area.

2. Normandy is also an area very much used by others outside of it because of its rural location and unique habitats. It provides vital green space for walkers, dog walkers, cyclists, naturists etc. thereby enhancing the quality of lives for others. A46 would create more noise and light pollution in the area thereby reducing the quality of life for all.

3. Wildlife habitats need protecting. We have noticed the decrease in bird populations these last 20 years and the change in species now coming to our garden. The dawn chorus is already greatly reduced here. Hedgehog numbers have also decreased. So even with no new developments, there are already pressures affecting the wildlife to this area.

4. Lack of suitable major roads to take the added traffic. The two roads which bound this proposed A46 site are C and D roads, narrow and unable to take the further number of cars which will be generated by the proposed development. The Guildford Road to which it is linked already suffers from much congestion at peak hours and it is not sustainable to add to the traffic.

5. The unsuitability of the two railway bridges on Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane. Both of these are narrow and angled in such a way as to make their use always to be approached with care. Westwood Lane is only a single carriageway. Adding to traffic flows on both these bridges are more likely to cause more accidents unless both can be rebuilt and the roads widened.

6. High water table. Our home is situated off of Flexford Road, which is on the slopes of the Hogs Back, built twenty years ago. This new four house development was supposedly very well served with large drains and a private pumping system to deal with the large amound of water run-off from the Hogs Back. However, our garden is always flooded after a downpour, despite the fact that we have three very large trees on and bordering the property and two drains bellow our lawn. Even a meter from the drain, the garden remains saturated due to the clay subsoil and the high water table.

The proposed A46 site similarly is flooded in winter. The homes surrounding the A46 site on Glaziers Lane have for many years had backflow problems with their sewage despite attempts by the Water Authorities to solve this problem. We fear concreting over such a large area, despite putting in good drainage, would only add to the frequent flood woes in this part of Normandy.

There is also a stream in the middle of the proposed site adding to the drainage issues.

1. Stress on local health services. We realise we have the luxury of Normandy GP Practice, but this facility is already overstretched with its present patient numbers. We frequently have a three week waiting list to see a Doctor in Fairlands or in Normandy. Would there be extra provision to cope with an increased population as proposed?
2. Little need for a secondary school in this area. We understand some Guildford schools are already 63% undersubscribed and a lower birthrate is expected. Also a private site at Rokers is being proposed for the needs of schooling in the west of Guildford. This site is better served with adequate A road access then at he proposed A46 site.

3. In Guildford, there are brown field sites, level carparks, empty office blocks etc that are available for development into housing. We are happy for Normandy to expand with its fair share of 30 – 40 homes being sensitively built. It is the doubling of its population that this proposed development would bring along with the stress on its services that we object to.

These are our objections and would be grateful if these would be taken into account.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4747  Respondent: 15495521 / Jonathan Young  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of Policy A46 (Normandy and Flexford village expansion)
The whole basis for the identification of this land as a strategic site appears to be achieved through the manipulation of the rules governing the criteria for “sustainability” and “sensitivity”. By considering the settlements of “Normandy” (to the north) and “Flexford” (to the south) as a single settlement for the purpose of “sustainability” the land referenced is considered as not to contribute to “open space”. However these settlements have been considered as separate ones for the purpose of calculating “sensitivity”, and thus achieving the outcome that was clearly intended, otherwise a consistent approach would have been taken for both metrics. Flexford and Normandy are referenced as separate villages in the majority of the Draft Plan, demonstrating this inconsistency. It could be viewed that the assessment of Normandy and Flexford has been manipulated to make the criteria for selecting site A46 achieve a predetermined outcome.

The documentation recently (February 2016) made publicly available indicates that a major developer has been soliciting GBC over the last two years with proposals for this land that include essentially a financial reward to GBC (disguised as a cost-neutral build of a large (7FE) secondary school) if planning was granted for the development of the houses. The selection basis has recently been clarified that the inclusion of a no-cost school was a significant factor. The requirement for the secondary school has not been demonstrated. Several of the neighbouring secondary schools are significantly under-subscribed. In fact, even if Site A46 were to be developed, the 1FE school requirement would easily be accommodated by the neighbouring schools. As has been widely communicated in advance of this public consultation, the inclusion of site A46 is based on an unsubstantiated and circular justification. The proposed secondary school is not viable on its own given its remote location from the major population centres. The proposed housing is not viable own its own without the proposed deal to include the provision of the schools. Neither are actually justified on any substantial evidence.

The selection of site A46 was based on a number of invalid and unsubstantiated statements. Firstly it was included because the land owners were willing to sell the land for development. This is not a valid selection criteria for developing Greenbelt. Almost any landowner would sell land for development if the price was attractive and which meant that they could themselves relocate. Secondly, it was determined by Guildford Borough Councillors that “Normandy would benefit” from the availability of additional local retail spaces. I do not believe that Normandy and Flexford residents have been consulted in anyway on this subjective statement. People that choose to live in rural areas are usually fully aware of the lack of retail space. This has not been an issue for me and my family in the 18 years that we have lived in this village.

I also have concerns that the suitability of the site for the 1100 or so houses has not been considered appropriately given the local infrastructure and environmental factors. The plan does not include a financial case for the long term damage / maintenance of the road and services infrastructure, nor considered the impact on the local environment. In fact Guildford
Borough Council previously objected to the large developments proceeding in Aldershot/Farnborough on the basis of the impact to the A323 that runs through Normandy. Policy A47 combined with the sites in Ash/Ash Green are of a similar scale to that opposed by Guildford Borough Council. The site selection includes as part of its justification the improvement to the Christmas Pie trail between Flexford and Guildford, to enable a cycle super-highway. This trail weaves through ancient woodland and currently contributes to the feeling of openness for many residents in all areas. As a layperson I would suggest that it would be impossible to upgrade this trail without significant damage to the ancient woodland that surrounds it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3270  Respondent: 15495873 / Gerard Duvé  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A46 – Land South of Normandy / North of Flexford

I object to removing site A46, 1100 homes, from the draft Plan. Like Wisley it is located in Green Belt but unlike Wisley, it is close to a railway station.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4896  Respondent: 15497857 / Elisabeth A Hawkey  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I also object strongly to Policy A46 Land south of Normandy and north of Flexford being build upon. It is an inappropriate size of development housing and school in an area of rural roads, two small railway bridges and it is totally unsuitable to increase the traffic on these unclassified roads. I lived there for the first 20 years of my life. I know the beauty the area has, this should not be sacrificed to increase housing. The congestion to surrounding villages is totally ridiculous. The infrastructure in this borough is not there to cope with 1000+ homes.Is there a need for this school?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5022  Respondent: 15500097 / Juliana Baxter  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I am writing to object to Guildford Borough Council’s Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016, with particular reference to Site A46.

The proposal to allocate this area of Green Belt land for residential development is inconsistent with policies set out in the Council’s draft local plan itself. In particular,

Policy P2: Green Belt

This policy states that “In accordance with national planning policy, the construction of new development will be considered inappropriate and will not be permitted unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated.” Very special circumstances have not been demonstrated. The proposal for Site A46 is essentially to allow a new town to be developed within a village in the Green Belt. This contradicts the statement in Policy P2 (4.3.24) that “Development within villages in the Green Belt is limited to small scale infilling”.

Policy D4: Development in urban areas and inset villages

The allocation of Site A46 for development is inconsistent with the statement in Policy D4 that “proposals for new development within inset village areas will have particular regard to (inter alia): the distinctive settlement pattern of the village and the important relationship between the built development and the surrounding landscape”. It completely fails to protect the important character (4.5.50) of the village of Normandy. Such a large-scale development would by definition fail to “protect local landscape and townscape character” as indicated in the LCA, which states that “development will be expected to: conserve, and where possible, enhance existing character … and respect the setting of, and relationship between, settlements and buildings in the landscape”.

Briefly, my reasons for objecting to the proposal are:

- The number of new homes indicated in the proposal is completely disproportionate to the size of the village and would fundamentally alter its
- Alternative sites exist where development would not impact on sensitive Green Belt land and on the character of a rural
- The argument that a school would be justified by the development is When no case exists for building a school, a school cannot be used as justification for the residential development.
- The local infrastructure is unable to support such a large-scale The roads in this rural area cannot sustain the inevitable increase, with consequent safety issues. Peak time traffic is already a serious issue. It is unrealistic to suggest that increased parking at Wanborough station or measures to encourage cycling and walking would go any significant way to addressing this. The fact is that there are often multiple cars per household and people choose to drive even for very short journeys.
- Significant flooding is already an issue in the

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I am writing to voice my strong objections to the plans proposed for Normandy and Flexford in the revised local plan.

**The supposed need for a new school**

At the borough council meeting it was agreed that the decision to proceed with any development in Normandy/Flexford would be entirely predicated on the need for a new school.

- The requirements for new schools are determined by the county council, and in reviewing their plans I cannot see anywhere a proposal for a new school to be built in this part of the borough. There is simply no requirement for this from Surrey County Council.
- In addition, our Country Councillor, Keith Witham, has done an excellent job in engaging with other schools in the area, and without exception, found that they are all under-subscribed. There was no support at all - quite the opposite, in fact - from school heads that a new school was needed.
- Surrey County Council has already started development on a new school at Mayford, also in the catchment area.
- This area of the borough is well covered for schools, notably Ash Manor, itself under-subscribed. There is no need for a new school in 'the west of the borough'.
- To suggest that a new school be built at considerable cost when there is no demonstrable need is financial mismanagement of the highest order; this is public money, and I do not want my taxes spent in this way.

Given this, your proposal to highlight the need for a new school as an 'exceptional need', that would override green belt restrictions, is spurious and totally unfounded.

**Building on the Green Belt**

Normandy is a small rural community sitting in the protected Green Belt, adjacent to Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Sites of Special Scientific Interest. The specific area of land you are proposing to build on is adjacent to Listed Buildings, and contains pastures, farming, hedgerows, trees and grasslands, all supporting a wide variety of wildlife. This is why I choose to live here. Your proposals would turn this pleasant rural community into a hideous housing estate, which I, and I suspect most residents of Normandy, simply do not want.

The purpose of the Green Belt is to protect the land around larger cities from urban sprawl, maintain areas for forestry, agriculture and wildlife, and to have open areas with clean air for outdoor activities. Your role as councillors is to preserve and protect that vision, not to ride rough shod all over it.

David Cameron recently wrote of the requirement to protect the green belt and ensure that planning decisions were made by local people. That is us, the residents of Normandy and Flexford, and not you in isolation.

Your rationale for attempting to justify this intrusion on to the Green Belt with 'exceptional circumstances' is spurious, flawed and, through linking it with an additional 1,100 residences, is self-fulfilling.

**The supposed need for additional housing**

I am frankly speechless that you feel a proposal to double the number of dwellings and triple the number of residents is in any way a sensible thing to do. And to then further propose that this all takes place on land designated in the Green Belt beggars belief. To link this with the supposed need for a new school at the same location represents a bizarre circular logic, each requirement justifying the other. Neither are needed.

Your plans speak of the 'potential' need for additional housing. If the need is only potential, the circumstances cannot be exceptional. Which, of course, they are not.

Nonetheless, you seek to bring the number of residents to 4,000. This because it is apparently a threshold for a sustainable village community. But we already have an active community in Normandy - we don't need to triple the population to do this. We already have a nursery school. We already have a primary school. We already have a surgery. We already have a pharmacy. We don't need 4,000 people!

You choose to combine the communities of Normandy and Flexford to reconcile your numbers of 4,000 residents, but these are separate communities. Seeking to bring them together and then add a further 2,500 resident is not 'coalescence', it is urban sprawl in action - you are supposed to prevent this, not cause it. You are justifying this with numbers and
spreadsheets, and ignoring the needs of the existing residents.

An additional 1,100 residences simply represents a scale of development that is wholly inappropriate in relation to the existing communities. The government itself has stated recently that there are no plans for such inappropriate development - why are you choosing to override this guidance?

The existing infrastructure in the village barely sustains the current population, how do you propose to cope with treble the number of residents:

- You cannot build new roads between Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane. They will become overly congested and vastly increase pollution - the exact opposite of what we currently have with the protected Green Belt. These roads have restrictions in terms of railway bridges and single file access (railway bridge in Westwood Lane)
- The Hogs Back and Guildford Road are already congested nightmares during the rush hour, your proposals will make this even worse
- again, the cost of upgrading this and all other infrastructure (drainage, electricity, new roads, telephone and internet upgrades) simply smacks of poor use of public funds

My suggestion would be that you look to develop brownfield sites, and not contemplate the unwarranted intrusion onto the Green Belt.

I believe the proposed changes are ill-considered, and I urge you to review and reject outright the changes to the local plan as they affect Normandy and Flexford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5027</th>
<th>Respondent: 15500481 / Rogier van Kasteren</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GBC Draft Borough Plan re Normandy - Site Allocation 46 and Site 47

I hereby like to object against the Draft Plan for Normandy.

As you get probably plenty of emails I would like to keep it short.

Reasons for Objection:

Traffic Chaos.

I live on Westwood lane (cunningham close) with a young family. Traffic is already a major problem.

From the numbers of cars, types of vehicles and their speed.

A development of this size would cause westwood lane to be a dangerous and unhealthy place to live.

Something we did not choose for when we bought this house.

School
A secondary school is not needed in this area as two nearby schools are under subscribed.

So please can we protect the greenbelt.

Also you are breaking an election promise as in July 2015 it was said: We always protect green belt and make sure planning decisions are made by local people.

I am very worried for the future of Normandy and my children. If the plans go ahead I will definitely be moving out of the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5269</th>
<th>Respondent: 15504577 / Indigo Planning Limited (Michael Wood)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Submitted on behalf of Kitewood Estates Ltd

2. Land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford (Policy A46)

- This section of the report assesses the Allocation of the south of Normandy and north of Flexford
- Policy A46 allocates land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford for a residential led mixed use development, to include:
  - Approximately 1,100 homes (C3), including some specialist housing and self-build plots (C3);
  - A nursing or residential care home (C2) with approximately 60 beds;
  - 6 Travelling Showpeople plots (sui generis);
  - Approximately 400 sqm of comparison retail floorspace (A1);
  - Approximately 300 sqm of convenience retail floorspace (A1);
  - Approximately 400 sqm of services (A2-A5);
  - Approximately 300 sqm of community facilities (D1);
  - A secondary school (D1) (up to eight form entry); and
  - A village green
- The development will provide a sustainable and inclusive community which will also enhance the accessibility to services of existing residents in Flexford and

Principle of the allocation
Sustainability

- We support the allocation of Policy A46 Land to the south of Normandy and north of The development will deliver a truly sustainable development to meet the three arms of Paragraph 7 of the NPPF.

- With regards social and economic elements of sustainability, the Council, in identifying an OAN for housing has sought to plan positively for social and economic In light of the analysis in Section 2, this allocation is crucial to the Council’s housing strategy over the plan period. The associated benefits of the scheme which will include a substantial amount of housing (bringing with it significant economic benefits) a much needed secondary school, village green, a local centre, Travelling Showpeople pitches and a nursing home will serve the existing community as well as future residents.

- With regards the environmental element of sustainability, this has been duly considered by the Council in preparing the draft All ecological considerations have been taken into account and wider Green Belt and landscape considerations and set out below.

- We agree that this opportunity, along with the relative sustainability of the site in close proximity to Wanborough Train Station, provides exceptional circumstance to support this allocation, in accordance with paragraph 83 of the

- A key strength of the site is its proximity to Wanborough railway station and accessibility to the local ‘A’ road The site scores well from a sustainability perspective (identified within Table C of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA)) and where the site currently lacks sustainability credentials (for example access to recreation, retail and education facilities), these are to be provided for within the proposed allocation.

Green Belt and Garden settlement

- We do, however, contest the Council’s findings with regards the value of the site in relation to the purposes of the Green The SA states at paragraph 10.11.3:

  "With regards to Green Belt, the point to note is that greater weight is now being applied to sensitivity than was the case in 2014, and it is only because Normandy/Flexford presents an exceptional circumstance that allocation is proposed here on a red-rated site."

- We are of the opinion that the site has relatively limited Green Belt With regards the NPPF purposes of the Green Belt:

  - Purpose 1 (to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas) – Neither Normandy nor Flexford could be regarded as large built-up The site’s comprehensive development will, effectively, create a new settlement which will, in itself, be sustainable. In this context, development of the site would not, in any way, cause urban sprawl.

  - Purpose 2 (to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another) The proposed development will create a new well-planned

  - Purpose 3 (to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment) – Development of the site will, inevitably, result in increased built-form in the However, the scheme will provide substantial improvements to
the accessibility of the site to help improve accessibility to outdoor recreation and ultimately, will not undermine the integrity of the countryside.

- Purpose 4 (to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns) – we agree that the site does not preserve the setting of a historic town

- The exceptional circumstances for the allocation of the Flexford/Normandy site to deliver much needed housing and social infrastructure justify the site’s

- Paragraph 52 of the NPPF promotes the supply of new homes through planning for larger scale developments such as new settlements or extensions to existing villages that follow the principles of Garden The Normandy/ Flexford development allocation clearly seeks to accord with paragraph 52 of the NPPF.

- The development will provide an integrated settlement with an accessible, centrally located local centre with retail space, community facilities, a school and outdoor recreation, including a village The settlement will provide high quality housing to meet local needs (in line with the other proposed policies of the Plan) that will integrate into its rural surroundings.

The school

- We support the identification of the site for a secondary The evidence base provided by GBC and Surrey County Council (SCC) clearly demonstrates the need for new secondary school capacity to support a likely additional pupil yield from new developments of 2,962.

- The site has the capacity and accessibility to deliver a well located and much needed secondary The school will serve the Blackwell Farm strategic allocation as well as the Normandy/Flexford development.

- We also support the wording of Policy A46 to direct the new school close to Wanborough railway station to encourage sustainable travel and facilitate a catchment which could include pupils from Ash and Guildford Town.

Quantum and transport

- We note that the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) at Table 2 identifies that the allocation for 1,100 homes will remain constant throughout the housing growth options (OAN to OAN, plus 34% buffer).

- The policy text states that interventions will be required which address the potential highway issues which could otherwise result from the

- The Guildford Borough Transport Strategy 2016 identifies aspirations to improve the A323 Guildford Road at various These are primarily relatively small scale improvements relating to traffic management and the environment. The exception to this is the proposed new road bridge and footbridge scheme to enable a level crossing closure on A323 Guildford Road adjacent to Ash railway station (Policy reference A30).

- It is currently unclear how much funding for the new bridge will come from planning It is imperative that the Normandy and Flexford scheme is not required to provide unjustified and excessive levels of contributions towards this scheme. The majority of planning obligation funding for this infrastructure project should be sought from the strategic growth of Ash and Tongham which is more directly related to the proposed bridge.
• The site has good access to the local rail network and we anticipate that a significant proportion of vehicle traffic will be directed east towards Guildford and the As such, only a limited proportion of vehicle movements are expected to use the Ash and Tongham proposed bridge (for access to the A331 and M3). Any financial contribution from the development of the site must be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development in order to comply with the CIL Regulations.

Design and layout requirements

• Policy A46 states that sensitive design at site boundaries will be required in order to have regard to the transition from village to We support the wording of the policy with regards the design requirements as it is not overly restrictive which will allow an appropriate layout to be prepared during design development.

Thames Basin Heath SPA

• The site is within the 5km buffer zone to the Thames Basin Heath Any impact on the SPA by the development will be mitigated in compliance with the relevant policy and legislative requirements.

Deliverability

• There are no barriers to the deliverability of the site which would prevent or delay housing coming forward within the short The infrastructure and design requirements associated with the development are relatively minor compared with other strategic sites within the Plan and will not delay the deliverability of the much needed housing.

• If allocated, we would expect the site to begin delivering houses within a five year The housing trajectory provided at Table 1 suggests that the site will not deliver housing until 2021/2022, we believe that the site can deliver housing sooner than this and would recommend this be updated to 2020/21.

Summary

• As noted in the previous section, the allocation of the strategic site at Normandy/Flexford is crucial for the Council to be able to implement its strategy. The site will provide much needed infrastructure that will serve the wider needs of the existing population, other key strategic development sites, as well as the future residents of the site itself.

• It has been identified that the site is sustainable and will enhance the sustainability of the surrounding area (Normandy and Flexford) through the delivery of new infrastructure and

• We agree that exceptional circumstances are required to release land from the Green Belt and the infrastructure provision of the site (alongside general housing need) provides this exceptional However, we contest that the findings of the GBCS do not accurately reflect the true value of the site in Green Belt terms when compared with analysis of other sites in the Borough.

• The development will create what is effectively a new self-contained This approach accords with Paragraph 52 of the NPPF to increase the supply of new homes through large village expansions or new settlements by applying the principles of Garden Cities.
• There are relatively few barriers to the delivery of the scheme and, as part landowner, our client would be in a position to begin delivering housing on the site within a five year

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5288  Respondent: 15504865 / Neville and Pat Bagley  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Objection to Normandy (policy A46)

Have you NO consideration for your local community, It is impossible to turn out of pinewood rd onto the A323 Guildford rd.

It is taking us 3 weeks to get a doctors appointment.

Please tell us how a couple of thousand more houses are going to improve this.

Have you tried to park down at our locale shops, by vale furnishings.

So you intend to make even this more difficult.

Proposing a secondary school, near the -A323 whose idea was that one.

Remember we have VOTE.

Please take a look at the Normandy Surrey boundary We are in Normandy, not Ash Aldershot as you put our postal address?

As per all the residents of Pinewood rd. Upper Pinewood rd.& Kirriemuir gardens.

This affects motor, house insurance.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5316  Respondent: 15505281 / Clive Nichols  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal to build 1100 houses in Normandy, The traffic would be horrendous & the services such as sewage etc. could not cope, the plan would double the size of the village & unless we are going to get new upgraded services the proposed development will spell disaster for all.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5563  **Respondent:** 15508257 / Andrew Whitehall  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing with regards to the above proposal build 1100 homes, a Secondary school & six travelling show pitches on GREEN BELT LAND! I have read the proposal & knowing the site(s) well, having lived in the village for most of my life and a child played in the proposed fields, I wish to strongly object due to the attributing factors listed below -

- Disproportionate & unsustainable development, on Green Belt land.
- Erosion of green belt land when there are brownfield sites, elsewhere in Guildford, far better suited with all the amenities already on their doorstep.
- Destruction of rural environment where currently protected brown snakes, deer & other wildlife live, 500 year old oak trees & open fields will just become a concrete mass, building houses on this type of land is not the way forward.
- The Council are ignoring the advice of previous planning inspectors that the fields of Normandy add to the openness of the green belt.
- As for the claims that a Secondary School is a necessity & “trumps” planning policy on greenbelt is simply untrue as there is no legal evidence to support this, as there are numerous Secondary Schools in our area all of who are undersubscribed.
- Glaziers Lane & Westwood Lane are country lanes and are not remotely suitable for the vast increase of traffic that would ensue from building these houses. The houses would actually be boxed in by road & rail, congestion on the roads in Normandy is already a major issue with multiple delays & accidents not to mention the pollution.
- People actually move to Normandy for the open fields & try to give their families a safe and rural life, fully aware there are not schools and large housing estates.
- Who is going to pay for the extra emergency services required to service this out of town area as this proposal would double the size of our village?

We have all been blessed with nature on our doorsteps, embrace it & protect it as it is so precious, if you agree for this to be all ripped away it will never, ever be replaced.

Surrey County Council has always prided itself on being one of the forerunners of providing green, open land for people to walk, ride & play in, don’t now destroy this legacy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5868  **Respondent:** 15576001 / Tony Kelley  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to object to the proposed policy of plan of Guildford borough council on the Following grounds.
1. The building of a school in an area where there is already a surplus of school places and any expansion can be
accommodated by organic growth of the schools already in Place.
2. The local plan in the result of Brexit is already out of date, with all projections now Invalid.
3. Destruction of green belt for the sake of building company profits, against the wish and well being of residents.
4. Destruction of valuable natural habitats and wildlife, and strain on nearby protected areas, outside A46
5. The latest proposals are a rushed mark 2 version after the previous plan was found to have several legal issues.
6. The failure of the plan to understand the changing shopping patterns. Where greater use of Internet shopping means there will be more brownfield sites becoming available for use.
7. There is a disproportionate scale of housing in one area, totally changing the character of a village rural environment, also impacting the view from an area of outstanding natural beauty, Surrey hills.
8. Traffic chaos, both Westwood lane and glaziers lane both have pinch points on the road caused by the railway bridges one above and one below the railway, increase in housing will therefore exacerbate this problem. A323 road between Aldershot and Guildford is already busy at peak times and difficult to join the main road from side roads whenever the A31 has problems A323 becomes an alternative and becomes a slow procession trying to cross the road for pedestrians is extremely difficult.
9. Safety, as above the A323 is already difficult and increasingly difficult for cycle users. Particularly children tiring to get to village primary school by cycle, it is unfortunately only a matter of time before there is a serious incident involving cyclists.
10. Housing development to the west of Normandy already approved will considerably increase traffic through the village, without this ill conceived plan to build a school with a 1000+ students and teaching staff, and 1100 housing units and traveller sites, which will just lead to travel chaos, poor air quality, and very unhappy residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5948  Respondent: 15579265 / Henry Lyon  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to speak on behalf of young people in Normandy about the proposed development.

I have lived here all my life and in that time I have noticed how congested the roads have become. As a cyclist, I would hate to see more traffic on the road and the traffic the new development would bring would increase the dangers of cycling. I appreciate there are bridleways but not every journey can be taken using bridleways.

I don’t understand why there will be a new school on the land which is mostly waterlogged throughout the year. Firstly they will struggle with playing any sort of sport on this consistently wet land and also the local schools in the area are undersubscribed. It seems the only reason for building a school might be a way for the developers to look favourably on their application. Which in some cases might be described as using a sweetener in order to get a contract.

Furthermore, the whole time I have lived here the land has been used by farmers showing that it is good agricultural land. Not only that, as I have grown up I have enjoyed the various forms of wildlife that this area has provided. Some years we are lucky enough to have barn owls, there are always tawny owls, deer, badgers, foxes and rabbits and also lizards and grass snakes. This very weekend, I found glow worms in the field. Along with these creatures there are also many birds that frequent this area including migrant birds that return each year. The ecology of this area would be greatly damaged by the proposed development.

Having spent my whole life living here, I cherish this open green space and all the memories of childhood I have here. I hope you consider very carefully what you will be losing if this development goes ahead.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5971</th>
<th>Respondent: 15579777 / Sandra Neale</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</td>
<td>Sound? ( )</td>
<td>Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the proposal of this site. It is unjustified and will destroy our rural environment. 100% increase in the number of homes will destroy Guildford boroughs greatest asset, the rural countryside. The idea of a school apart from housing is not needed at all. Secondary schools to the west of the borough are undersubscribed by 736.

Also I object because this unrealistic growth will force more traffic onto busy A roads and minor roads, causing more exhaust pollution, threatening the elderly and children.

GBCs Local Plan is against the wishes of local residents.

I STRONGLY OBJECT TO THIS PROPOSED PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6043</th>
<th>Respondent: 15582945 / Kevin Memery</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</td>
<td>Sound? ( )</td>
<td>Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My main objections to the proposal by GBC to build houses and a school on sites in Normandy and Flexford are:

That it is an unnecessary intrusion on precious green belt land. GBC should make greater attempts to build on brown field sites within the town.

The infrastructure is inadequate to cope with the resulting increase in traffic.

It is unlikely that the main sewers will cope with the increased population. On the A 323 near the entrance to Slade Lane and Wyke Lane sewage has belched out of a manhole onto the road on several occasions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6150</th>
<th>Respondent: 15585217 / Christine King</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I would like to object to the proposed plan for a number of reasons.

1. I do not feel that the need for another secondary school has been proven. The secondary schools in Guildford and Ash have many spaces available currently. If the intention is that the proposed new houses should provide the students, it is unrealistic to assume that there will be sufficient numbers in convenient age groups to attend such a school. If the intention is to 'bus' students in from either Ash or Guildford area, I have to wonder if any councillor has been on either the A31 or the A323 (mostly 30mph) during the morning and evening? The roads are frequently at a stand-still and in the case of the A323 in a dangerous position, particularly due to the number of primary schools on the route. I find it unbelievable that the already over-burdened infrastructure should be put to more strain.

2. The land is Green Belt, and I do not believe that any 'special circumstances' have been proved. There are plenty of already suburban areas which could have smaller developments which would not have the appalling potential of such a large scale plan on a rural site. This area is an oasis between the Guildford and Aldershot/Farnborough developments and unsuitable for such a large scale plan.

3. The area is below the slopes of the Hogs Back and already has the potential for flooding. Run off from the hills is frequent and well known. Have the council learned nothing from the flooding locally? Has the council learned nothing from the warnings about building on land which forms a natural drain?

4. Is there a proper, considered study of the effect of such a large scale development on local flora and fauna? Green Surrey is gradually disappearing as gardens are tarmac-ed over and shopping centres encourage out of town traffic and parking. How can using agricultural land in this small village be actively considered when there are brown field sites available?

Why has the council considered massive developments which have the potential for immense impact on infrastructure, environment and community, rather than smaller developments in brown field sites, infilling and town outskirts? A cynical person may believe it is for ease of administration....Please take note of the community and properly represent the residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2417  Respondent: 15585217 / Christine King  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to you to support the removal of Sites A46 and A47 from the Plan. It is essential that the already congested, narrow roads are not required to take more traffic, as already happens during the frequent issues on the Hogs back and A3 into Guildford. Flooding already occurs on these roads, and on the fields in the lee of the Hogs Back and its steep slopes Wastewater, sewage and other services cannot cope with a development of the size originally suggested.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2189  Respondent: 15585793 / Mark Horigan  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.

With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become *even more* biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is *grossly unfair* on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6323  Respondent: 15588833 / Yvonne Eshelby  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As a resident of this Parish for some considerable years, I wish to present my objection in the strongest terms to GBC latest proposed submission which will undoubtedly affect the allocation of land both south of Normandy and North of Flexford for the future.

My objections are based upon common sense which the council has failed to recognise in any of their proposals.

1. We cannot take any further building works in such a small area of green belt land which had previously been promised as being safeguarded.

2. The infrastructure will not be able to absorb additional traffic

3. Building works on the land will result in more flooding to present home owners despite the reassurance of the planners

4. In addition to the incredible number of extra dwellings proposed where are the children going to go to school because the existing ones are already over capacity in numbers.

5. The rural aspect of Normandy & Flexford will be totally removed and it will become yet another sprawling housing estate which it was never intended for.

6. Our doctors surgeries would not be able to take on any additional patients, which would put more strain on the service they already provide.

In the past the village has lost a post office; butchers, garage/petrol station x 2, village stores x 2.
Planning consent is given to all and sundry which have already changed the persona of the village and yet when individual house owners apply for permission to extend their homes, they are more often than not rejected on the basis that it is not in keeping with the area.

WHY CAN OTHER PROPOSALS SUCH AS THIS LATEST ONE BE EVEN CONSIDERED. Is it for the financial gain for some people and or departments?

The personnel who make these decisions I am sure do not live in this community and will not feel the terrible affect it will have on our community.

PLEASE LET US WORK TOGETHER TO BRING BACK THE COMMUNITY SPIRIT AND ALLOW THE EXISTING OCCUPANTS MAKE OUR VILLAGE AND SURROUNDING AREAS A PLACE WE CAN ALL BE PROUD OF AND NOT JUST ANOTHER MONEY MAKING EXERCISE FOR DEVELOPERS ETC.

We elect our local councillors and politicians to work on our behalf and I am afraid that you are failing to meet our expectations

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6355  Respondent: 15589281 / Frances Warne  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We are writing to strongly object to the large development being proposed in the GBC Local Plan on Site A46 for over 1100 houses and a secondary school on 67 hectares of green belt land in Normandy and Flexford.

It is stated in this revised proposed local plan that this land could be removed from the green belt due to ‘exceptional circumstances’, but these have not been demonstrated by GBC. We believe this is a completely developer-led proposal, with Taylor Wimpey offering to provide a school as a sweetener if they can develop the land. However, there is no evidence to prove there is a need for an extra school in the area; two schools within 3 and 5 miles of the site are undersubscribed which, together with the proposed new UTC which is to be opened in 2017/18, should negate the need for a new school in Normandy.

Site A46 is not a suitable site for a school or for the large-scale development proposed. The minor C and D class roads which would serve them are completely inadequate and unsuitable to carry the inevitable vast increase in traffic from the new householders travelling to and from the development and from parents dropping off and picking up their children from school. There is a height restriction at the railway bridge in Westwood Lane, and the bridge over the railway at Glaziers Lane has a bend at its blind apex, making this a dangerous section of road. It is a common occurrence when driving over the bridge to meet oncoming vehicles on the wrong side of the white line.

Even though GBC envisage that many children will be using the train or cycling to school, this is unlikely as most parents will opt to drive their children due to safety reasons. It would be extremely hazardous for children to cycle on the roads...
given the volume of traffic on all of the surrounding roads in the area and the width of Glaziers Lane. In addition, Glaziers Lane is used extensively by heavy lorries, more often than not exceeding the 30 mph speed limit, using Glaziers Lane as a route between the A3 or A31 and the Aldershot Road. It is difficult to see how any road improvements could be made to these local lanes to improve traffic flow for the future and we do not think this has been considered fully when suggesting this site for development.

It is not unusual for a journey during rush hour (from around 7 am) from Normandy to Guildford to take 40 minutes to an hour due to the volume of traffic whether using the A31, A3 or A323. The increase in traffic created by the new development and school would inevitably lead to more road chaos and have the effect of extending traffic congestion to include the whole area of Normandy and Flexford in addition to the daily queues at the top of Wanborough Hill and junctions with the Aldershot Road during rush hour. With the increase in traffic, it is also likely there will be more serious and fatal road accidents particularly at the dangerous road junctions where Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane meet the A323.

Whilst we understand the need for new homes, we feel any new developments should be built in small pockets of land, by infilling and using brownfield sites, preferably with all towns and villages of Surrey bearing an equitable quota of new housing. To centre such a large development between our two small settlements of Flexford and Normandy will decimate a very special area of countryside which is one of only a few truly rural open and accessible spaces remaining in the ever expanding urban sprawl of the borough.

In an interview with Sir Andrew Motion (April 2015) the Prime Minister stated

“Green belt land is extremely precious. Protecting the lungs around our cities is paramount for me. I am very clear about that – as is our National Planning Policy framework. This framework compels local councils to develop Local Plans, protecting not just the green belt but any other important areas of green space. The Local Plan sets out where things get built or not. The combination of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Local Plans provide strong protections against green belt development. **Councils are exempt from meeting local housing need if constraints like green belt make it impossible.**”

The land between Normandy and Flexford provides an extremely precious green lung amongst the built up areas of Ash, Tongham and Guildford. The proposed area of land includes a wide variety of habitats – ancient woodland, streams, prime arable and pastoral land with field margins lined by many mature trees and hedgerows.

Should this development on green belt land be allowed to go ahead, there would be a devastating and irreversible loss of wildlife as the land in question supports many species of birds, animals, trees and plants. The rural aspect of Flexford and Normandy has attracted new wildlife to the area in recent years, for example red kites and buzzards have also become daily sightings. We commonly see deer, foxes, hedgehogs and bats, and see and hear many birds such as skylarks, whitethroats, blackcaps, yellowhammers, and fieldfares and redwings in addition to the more common or garden birds on the proposed site. Although some of these are not protected species, it is an indication of how rich our village’s rural environment is.

It would be wrong to destroy this beautiful rural area to simply provide an easy route to enable the borough to meet a substantial quota of housing target with one large development rather than identifying more suitable brownfield sites and smaller sites for more widespread but fairer developments. If it is allowed to proceed it will completely annihilate 67 hectares of precious countryside, devastate a thriving population of wildlife and take away the very essence of our village.

We hope that our objection and comments will be taken into consideration by the planning committee.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6468</th>
<th>Respondent: 15591777 / Joanne Miethke</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to object to Guildford Borough Council's new draft local plan A46 Normandy & Flexford. We have lived on the Guildford Road in Normandy for 18 years and consequently have first-hand experience of how increasingly busy the road has become over that time. To now learn that the draft local plan is to double the size of the village in Normandy, adding 1,100 new homes in addition to a secondary school is extremely alarming. Just imagine all the extra traffic, increased danger, noise, pollution and congestion that would cause on local roads (not to mention all the years of construction prior.)

I object to the claimed need for a secondary school on this Green Belt site. The school would not be required if the site were not allocated for housing development so both cancel one another out. There is no proven need for a new school as expansions are planned at existing schools in the borough and a new technical college will be available from 2018.

Proposals for housing development all around us, i.e. Wood Street Village, Fairlands and Holly Lane mean that our beautiful rural location will be destroyed. What are the "exceptional circumstances" that justify the proposed release of site A46 from the Green Belt?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6521  Respondent: 15594657 / Jane Owen  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to strongly object to the proposed Normandy development on Green Belt land.

The proposed development would cause chaos on the local country roads especially on the two country lanes Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane which bound two sides of the proposed development which are boxed in by two railway bridges. One of the bridges is only one car per time and the other a very narrow bridge over the railway that has houses surrounding the railway land. Thus resulting in major congestion as the 1100 new houses will have 2000 or more vehicles and traffic pickups and drop offs to and from the proposed 1500 pupil school. The A323 is already backing up at peak times because of the volume of existing traffic and the railway crossing at Ash blocking the twisty country road through Normandy.

Can you explain why we need a new school in Normandy with 1500 places? I cannot see that there is a good argument for such a development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6555  Respondent: 15595329 / Lindsay Franks  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I object to the amount of houses which I being proposed to the area - there is no infrastructure in place to deal with the amount of new road traffic which this will produce.
2. I object to the building of a new secondary school - there are many spaces available to local existing secondary schools and as I currently work at the local primary school which is full at present and would be unable to cope with an additional 1000 homes - where would these children go to primary school? why are we concerned with secondary school when they will need to be in education before then and nothing is in place for that.
3. I object to the amount of traffic this will increase our roads by. At the moment there are a few dangerous roads as it is when pulling out of Beech Lane and this is only going to make things worst and with doubt an accident will happen .
4. I object to the amount of land which is going to be lost - this is a greenbelt area and it will be lost purely for the construction of a concrete area. We are constantly being reminded that we need to encourage our children to be outside and enjoying the fresh air and green space but this is trying to be taken away from us which is tragic.
5. I object to the amount of homes which are being proposed . I understand that new homes are needed but how many of these will actually go to Normandy residents. This has been proved with the development on Beech lane where the house were only suppose to go to Normandy residents but that is not the case and many of them are now being lived in by people who have no connection to the village at all.
6. I object as this is my village and needs to remain as a village. Adding 1000+ homes with still no shops, hardly any local transport this is an incredible oversight from both the planners and Guildford Borough Council too.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I am writing to object to the proposed development in Normandy and Flexford which will mean the complete destruction of its rural environment. I appreciate that more housing is required but the scale of this proposal can only result in a chaotic situation for Normandy.

The traffic situation is already getting out of hand - with queues often forming to get on to the Aldershot Road.

Has consideration been given to the excessive noise and pollution which will undoubtedly result from a development of this size?.

Will the Normandy Surgery be able to cope with the vast increase in numbers?

I worry also about the destruction to wildlife in the area.

My home has been subject to a bit of flooding during the past 5 years. I have now put in place gulleys etc. to try to prevent this happening again. Am I now to be concerned about what might happen if this development goes ahead. Drainage problem??

I understand that there are schools in the area around this Parish which are undersubscribed, so do we need another school?

Our precious countryside needs protection.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7009  Respondent: 15616225 / Rachel Lane  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I write to OBJECT to the above proposal.

**The need for a school**

I cannot find any exceptional evidence to prove the need for a secondary school.

Even if Normandy was extended by 175%, the number of pupils at such a school who actually come from Normandy would be around 12% - and that is on the assumption that new housing is taken up by families with school children (and not the older, retired ABC1s and downsizers who typify this area). This means a massive 88% / 1320 pupils would have to commute in from other areas not less than 2.8 miles away to over 6 miles away. It is my opinion that a school should be located closest to wherever the majority of its pupils live. This is also reflected in the usual admissions criteria, where pupils are admitted on an “as the crow flies” shortest distance to their homes. Wherever possible the school commute should be in safe walking or cycling distance for the majority of pupils.

I have carefully reviewed all the surrounding schools in the areas of Guildford, Ash, Tongham and Blackwell Farm – their intake, capacity to extend and most importantly, the distances of each “as the crow flies” the shortest distance to pupils’ homes being the key admissions criteria, vs. the site at Normandy. For test purposes I took at central postcode on Glaziers Lane and Central /High street postcode in the areas reviewed.

Key findings include:
1. Families already have a choice of 2 to 4 or more schools in each of the areas, where at least 2 secondary schools are within 1.5 miles of the central postcode of each area. By comparison the distance to the site at Normandy is 2.8 miles or more.

2. Almost 85% of existing surrounding schools within each area are undersubscribed; one is only at 43% capacity and has 511 spaces. As such the opening of a school at Normandy would be detrimental to the intake and sustainability of these schools and in turn, itself.

3. 45% of all schools are already extending or have the capacity to extend further. As birthrates in the area continue to fall, and home schooling continues to rise, it would be foolish to build another school until there is an actual proven need. It would be a better use of money and ultimately to the respective communities to proceed with caution and extend the existing schools, should the requirement present itself.

4. Almost 18% of schools reviewed are new and will provide 1320 additional spaces by 2018.

**The impact of a school**

A secondary school in Normandy would be detrimental to the sustainability of existing schools as the majority are undersubscribed.

A secondary school at site A46 can only be accessed by road or train. There are no safe cycle or walking routes due to the speed and narrowness of the highways, many have no pavements either given the rural location.

**Where will the bulk of pupils come from?**

Tongham, 4.4 miles away from site A46. There is no train station. Pupils will have to be driven via the severely gridlocked A31 Hogs Back.

Blackwell Farm 4.7 miles away from site A46 - there is no train station. Pupils will have to be driven via the gridlocked A31 Hogs Back.

Guildford – pupils can get the train if they live in the town centre but if they are North Guildford they will need to be driven via the heavily congested A323 Guildford Road or dropped into Guildford town centre, which would exacerbate the already severe congestion at Guildford station an gyratory. (N.B your proposal to increase train services on the Guildford to Aldershot line will also further impede the flow of traffic on the A323, since a cause of the long queues is the level crossing at Ash). Driving to and from Guildford town centre on a school run would not become costly and unsustainable for many – a round trip journey from Guildford to Normandy and back takes around 1.5 hours or more at peak time via the Hogs Back.

Ash – 2.8 miles away from site A46 – pupils can get the train if they are in walking distance however it is likely many would be driven further exacerbating traffic issues on the A323 Guildford Road which was identified in OGSTAR (Options Growth Scenarios Transport Assessment Report) study as being at full capacity already, without the addition of a couple of thousand more cars at peak time.

**The existing highways infrastructure**

Site A46 is surrounded on each side by -

Glaziers Lane; a mile long D60 unclassified country road which is a corridor (no roads off it) with few pavements and low intermittent street lighting (as it is a rural area). Westwood Lane; a C16 country road with a small angled railway bridge and blind spot which reduces traffic to single file. There are few pavements and little or no street lighting too. These roads see many accidents with vehicles leaving the road in many cases. Increasing the traffic on these will result in many more accidents and fatalities.

These roads were not built to support the weight of traffic they are now taking, let alone further dramatic increases. Drains in these roads have collapsed under the weight of traffic - indeed Clancy Dowcra confirmed to me the drains under the road outside my property have collapsed again during their site visit Monday 20/6/16. Both Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane suffers from flooding and drainage issues, including site A46. It is fair to say substantial, ongoing costly
remedial works to highways will be required to the immediate roads to support the extra 4000+ cars at peak time which will be hugely disruptive to the village and site.

Westwood Lane/ Glaziers Lane through Flexford Lane continues through Wanborough through an area of outstanding Natural Beauty to Wanborough Hill, where queuing traffic waits to exit onto Puttenham Hill/ Puttenham Heath Rd to connect to the heavily congested A31 Hogs Back and A3 at Compton. At the other end it exits onto the A323 Guildford Road.

The secondary school will bring in around 2000 cars to these roads, trying to enter and exit within 30minutes. This will result in long queues and absolute access and exit chaos at school run times. I have attached photos whilst sat in static traffic queues which we already endure on a daily basis.

This development does not have the highways infrastructure to support it and there is no significant opportunity to improve it further. I would like to take this opportunity to remind planners that there has been no significant highways improvements in this area for the past 30 years with no budget for further work.

Given the evidence in this letter and additionally, the data in my objection email to Councillors dated 11.05.16 I am forwarding with this letter, the proposed development at site A46 is clearly not an ‘enabling development’. There are alternative sites which are better suited to development without the associated highways cost and sacrifice of highest grade green belt land eg. behind the pub on the Guildford Road and at Rokers by Fairlands. Thorough research must be undertaken.

Finally, the development itself. Taylor Wimpey build cheap & cheerful houses and retail parks. They never build schools. They will sub contract this out to another developer and this will cost more.. The plan for an ‘estate’ of Taylor Wimpey homes would not be in keeping with the rest of the village – where houses all differ and have grown organically. If any development must happen, properties must be sympathetic to the area and in far less numbers.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attaching documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7062</th>
<th>Respondent: 15619201 / Michael Conoley Associates (James Deverill)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site Location
The site is located to the east of Glaziers lane and to the north of Flexford. It is greenfield land, under private ownership and immediately deliverable.

The alterations to the settlement boundary within the proposed Local Plan 2016 submission now include the large A46 site to the west. Should the redefined settlement zone be agreed, the site will be bordered completely on two sides. An extract from the proposed Local Plan illustrating this is included below: <see attachments>

It is within the 400m to 5km zone of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area and is moderate/good agricultural land (grade 3). It is located within Flood Zone 1 (low risk).

Assessment of Site Opportunities and Constraints
Outside Guildford town centre, established urban areas, inset villages and identified Green Belt villages, the site is in a very sustainable location. It is adjacent to Wanborough Railway Station which has two services an hour to Guildford taking just 7 minutes and two services an hour to Aldershot taking 11 minutes. A regular bus service also runs down Glaziers Lane (with a bus stop next to the site) linking the area to Guildford, Aldershot and Woking. The site is also only
2 miles from the Puttenham junction of the A31 Hogs Back giving excellent vehicular access to the rest of the borough and south to Farnham. It is well located for easy access to cycling routes.

Site Planning History
The site was identified as potential development area H10-B in the Green Belt and Countryside Study. It scored three against the purposes of the Green Belt and is ranked 22nd in terms of sustainability criteria. The site was classified as suitable, available and viable for residential development in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA reference part of site 2010). It was also included within the Local Plan Issues and Options (reg 18) document and given the reference 68. This document concluded that if sufficient housing land cannot be found in the urban areas and village settlements, this site is potentially suitable for residential development.

Suitability for Inclusion within the Local Plan 2016
As discussed in section 2, the Local Plan submission proposes a number of large urban extensions and new settlements to deliver the levels of assessed housing required over the 15 year plan period. Many of these sites are dependent on infrastructure improvements which are yet to be agreed with the Department of Transport. Therefore, the majority of the housing proposed is back-loaded to the later years of the plan and may not be deliverable within this time period at all.

There is a shortfall within the Local Plan submission of housing which could be delivered in the first five years of the plan period. This site could help reduce the shortfall as it is within a very sustainable location, available for development and deliverable within 1 to 5 years. It has been assessed previously and found by the Council to be suitable for residential development should sufficient housing land not be found in urban areas and village settlements. The Local Plan submission does not meet this requirement and therefore the site at Glaziers Lane should be promoted by the Council.

Comparison with alternative sites allocated within Normandy and Flexford
The Local Plan submission allocates two sites in Normandy and Flexford for residential development. Policy A46 is a large village expansion between the two settlements and will be of mixed use including 1,100 new homes. Policy A47 is a site on Land to the East of the Paddocks, Flexford and is allocated for 50 dwellings. Direct comparison between these sites and the land at Glaziers Lane is clearly difficult given the differing scales of development but this site will have considerably less impact on the landscape and ecology.

An assessment of the landscape impact of development on these sites has been undertaken by Jon Etchells Consulting; a practice registered with the Landscape Institute, with extensive experience of landscape design and assessment. With regard to A47 he notes;

“The landscape to the west of Glaziers Lane is very different; it is more rural, relates far less to the settlement edge and is of much higher quality. It is in productive agricultural use, is expansive with long range views across it, and contains a number of large areas of Ancient Woodland. Development here would have significant adverse effects on the landscape, over a wide area.”

And concludes that;

“This large scale development would be likely to have adverse effects on the setting of the nationally designated landscape of the Surrey Hills AONB, as it would cover a large area and would include some large scale buildings for the proposed secondary school, which is intended to be at the southern end of the draft allocation site, closest to the AONB. This potential effect would be increased significantly if the AONB boundary were to be extended to the north into the AGLV, as is currently under consideration.”

In comparison, the landscape of the application site is small scale, enclosed and strongly related to the settlement edge. It contains no valuable landscape features, and would have no effects on the setting of the nearby AONB by virtue of its limited extent, buildings of residential scale only and screening along its boundaries.

The site at A47 is similar in landscaping terms to the site at Glaziers Lane as it abuts the settlement, is well screened and comprises residential garden and paddocks. However, the majority of it is designated as a SNCI and lies within an area identified as a ‘water vole alert area’. A stream cuts through the centre of the site and potential mitigation measures may restrict the actual developable area. It appears unlikely, therefore, that this site can deliver the number of houses proposed
and it seems somewhat perverse for the Local Plan to designate an area for nature conservation value, but also propose its
development, if there are alternative sites such as land east of Glaziers Lane available.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: A9Rei4p70_11malfdn_vs.jpg (198 KB)

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7137  Respondent: 15629025 / Surrey County Council (Sir or madam)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A46

**Land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford Page 229**

We note that the site was proposed to be removed from the green belt and safeguarded for potential future development in
the previous draft Local Plan. The current version proposes to

bring this site forward for development in this plan period to meet Guildford’s housing needs.

Given this position and in the context of our forecast needs for additional school places over the plan period, required to
support the proposed new housing to the west of Guildford, it is our view that the option to locate a secondary school here
is acceptable, provided that the scale of housing proposed on this site is delivered to meet the need identified in the plan.
This would also help to meet sustainable transport objectives, particularly if the scale of housing supports the delivery of
the rail connectivity proposals and the station improvements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7153  Respondent: 15629377 / The Woodland Trust (Jack Taylor)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference number</th>
<th>Name of site</th>
<th>Nearest town</th>
<th>Development description</th>
<th>Woodland adjacent or within?</th>
<th>Type of woodland affected (e.g. ASNW, PAWS, secondary) &amp; grid reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A46</td>
<td>Land to the South of Normandy and North of Flexford</td>
<td>Flexford</td>
<td>Residential Lead mixed use development</td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>Walden’s Copse ASNW, SU926510 Pussey’s Copse ASNW, SU929505 Unnamed ASNW, SU927506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7471  Respondent: 15649345 / Matthew Sarti  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the inclusion of policy A46 Normandy/Flexford within the local plan. The site is green belt, the number of houses appears disproportionate to the area itself. The only exceptional circumstances that could apply to this site is the building of a school, however this would be predicated on the basis of a housing number that may be incorrect and should be subject to constraints including building on green belt itself.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7833  Respondent: 15674273 / Savills for Thames Water (Katherine Jones)  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We have significant concerns regarding Wastewater Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the wastewater treatment capacity in this area is highly unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Significant infrastructure upgrades are likely to be required to ensure sufficient treatment capacity is available to serve this development. Thames Water would welcome the opportunity to work closely with the Local Planning Authority and the developer to better understand and effectively plan for the sewage treatment infrastructure needs required to serve this development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: Sewage Treatment Works upgrades can take 18 months to 3 years to design and build. Implementing new technologies and the construction of a major treatment works extension or new treatment works could take up to ten years. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the infrastructure is in place ahead of occupation of the development. We have significant concerns regarding Wastewater Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the wastewater network capacity in this area is highly unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Significant drainage infrastructure is likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.

The proposed 1,100 dwellings and other development exceed the capacity trigger levels for available network. The site would drain to Hockford STW which has a current Population Equivalent of 15,400. The scale of development proposed is significant for a STW of this size so a developer funded impact study required to understand implications of development.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the imbalance of the Plan across the borough. With the removal of site A46 from the Plan and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough, 40.6% of the 11,350 homes proposed in this Plan are sited within 3 miles of where I live, most of them in the Green Belt. We are already suffering from traffic chaos when accidents or roadworks are causing problems on the A3 or M25. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to policy A46 on the grounds that local residents have not been consulted sufficiently on this proposal, as required under the NPPF.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

The national and local policies on biodiversity and the natural environment listed below all make strong statements about the need to minimise the impact of development on biodiversity and to conserve the natural environment.

*The National Planning Policy Framework*
The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that “The purpose of planning is to help to achieve sustainable development” and it describes three “dimensions” relevant to this aim: economic, social and environmental. The explanation for how the environmental aspect plays a role includes the statement “…helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently…..” (see point 7 of the section in the NPPF dealing with achieving sustainable development).

In section 11 headed “Conserving and enhancing the natural environment”, it is stated inter alia that planning policy should protect and enhance valued landscapes and minimise impacts on biodiversity, providing net gains in biodiversity wherever possible to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, by promoting “the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations…..”.

**Guildford Borough Council**

Guildford Borough Council (GBC) interprets the NPPF through their 'Policy I4' which emphasises the commitment to biodiversity stating: "The Council will conserve and enhance biodiversity and will seek opportunities for habitat restoration and creation, particularly within and adjacent to Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs)".

Proposals for development must demonstrate how they will deliver appropriate net gains in biodiversity. Where proposals fall within or adjacent to a BOA, biodiversity measures should support that BOA’s objectives. The Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) will set out guidance on how this can be achieved. European sites designated as Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), National Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), local SNCIs and Local Nature Reserves are all shown on the Policies Map or as subsequently updated.

Policy I4 goes on to say that "Permission will not be granted for proposals that are likely to materially harm the nature conservation interests of local sites unless clear justification is provided that the need for development clearly outweighs the impact on biodiversity."

**The UK Biodiversity Action Plan**

The UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UK BAP) describes the UK’s biological resources. In Surrey recognised priority habitats include lowland dry acid grassland, lowland meadows, flood plain grazing marsh, wet woodland, hedgerows and arable field margins. It is known that farmland offers important habitat for wildlife. The UK BAP also identifies priority species for conservation which include rare and also declining “species of mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, fish, plants, mosses, lichens and fungi”. Examples of priority species in Surrey include farmland birds which should be protected from further decline by maintaining and enhancing current populations wherever possible. As it says: “Development could impact on these species by direct loss of habitat, but also through increased recreational disturbance, especially associated with residential developments.”

The proposed area for development in Normandy and Flexford encompasses many of the above biological resources, recognised priority habitats and priority species for conservation. It is also relevant to the Biodiversity Plan for Surrey (see 2.4 below).

**The Biodiversity Plan for Surrey**

The Biodiversity Plan for Surrey (BPS) incorporates changes brought about by the NPPF, identifies the importance of Ancient Woodland and veteran trees for biodiversity interest. Such habitats support woodland plants with limited dispersal abilities, mammals such as bats and dormice which are protected species, as well as woodland birds and butterflies (many of which are in decline nationally), invertebrates and often lichen, mosses and fungi.

It is clear that the proposals for development in Normandy and Flexford (A46 and A47) directly conflict with these policies and I object to these development proposals as GBC have failed to show how they will conserve and enhance biodiversity.

**Objection to Policy A46 on the grounds that GBC have failed to take into consideration the impacts upon wildlife and habitats both within the proposed development site and in SSSI’s and SNCI’s in the surrounding area in breach of Section 11 of the NPPF**
Impact on the wider environment of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area

I believe that the Plan is unsound in relation to Policy A46 as the Habitats Regulations Assessment prepared for GBC does not take sufficient account of the impact that this huge proposed development specifically will have upon the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA) which is a European Site as defined under the Habitats Directive and Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended).

The proposed development is considerably less than five kilometres away from the TBH SPA and not much beyond the 400m exclusion zone, occupying an area between under 1km, to just over 2km, from the TBH SPA. It has been indicated that the cumulative effect of further residential development up to 5 km from protected heathlands will have a significant adverse effect on the heaths. Furthermore, Natural England believes that recreational use of the heaths arising from housing developments up to five kilometres away from a SPA will create disturbance to rare bird populations. The TBH SPA is an internationally important habitat for three rare species of bird - the Dartford warbler, woodlark and nightjar. The latter two are ground nesting and therefore particularly susceptible to disturbance from people and animals (including dogs being exercised).

I therefore question whether enough - or indeed any - consideration been given to the potentially detrimental effect that the proposed strategic development between Normandy and Flexford will have on this internationally important site.

A survey in 2008 showed that more than 83% of visitors to the SPA arrived by car and that 70% of those had come from within 5km of its access point. A very large proportion of the TBH SPA visitors are dog walkers, many of whom visit a particular site on a regular basis. Two hundred and sixty four dogs are likely to come with the proposed development, the current ratio of dogs per household being 24/100, so this could potentially attract between 26 and 132 extra dog-walkers a day.

To deter dog-walkers from visiting the TBH SPA, any Suitable Alternative Green Space (SANG) in the proposed development would have to be of exceptional quality, as the Nightingale Road and Dolley's Hill entrances to the TBH SPA are only either 5 minutes away by car, or 20 minutes on foot. Whatever the size, the SANG would be a very small area in which to exercise 264 dogs. A small number of irresponsible dog owners, who do not scoop the poop, will make such a small area unattractive for walk and play. This is already a problem on Normandy Common.

Another factor is that some areas where a SANG might be located are muddy in wet weather and throughout the winter, whereas many of the tracks on the TBH SPA are dry in wet weather.(including the winter). For those dissatisfied with the proposed SANG for whatever reason, or those wanting a longer walk, the natural alternative is the TBH SPA. If only 10% of dog owners use the TBH SPA, there would be 26 extra dogs a day using the TBH SPA; if 50% do, it would be an extra 132 dogs a day.

I strongly believe, that given the proximity of the proposed development to two entrances to the TBH SPA it will be impossible to design a SANG that will deter many residents from using the TBH SPA to walk their dogs. This will have a very serious impact on the wildlife and overall environment (unique flora and fauna) of this internationally important area.

Natural England states: “Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) are European designated sites, they are afforded protection under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. Generally speaking, when considering the impacts upon European sites, the Local Planning Authority, under the provisions of the Habitat Regulations, should have regard for any potential impacts that a plan or project may have”.

‘Natural England disagrees with the conclusions reached by the Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA) and Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and advise that the plan is unsound on this basis’. Natural England states further: “We also have concerns that the Council does not appear to have adopted Government planning policy set out at paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) stating that local plans should meet objectively assessed development needs unless specific policies in the NPPF (such as protecting designated wildlife sites and landscapes) indicate development should be restricted.”

The Habitats Regulation Assessment document is incorrect. In Section 18 Policies 9, 10, and 13 are assessed but not the policies proposed in this version of The Plan.
I therefore object to the proposed A46 on these grounds.

**Impact of increased volumes of traffic on wildlife**

If the proposed development goes ahead, there will be an increase in pollution with respect to air quality, noise and light levels, particularly where cars have to queue at junctions or obstructions. The transport strategy proposed by GBC for this strategic site contains no scheduled improvements for Glaziers Lane and very few for Westwood Lane, both rural lanes. The A323 to the north of the site will also be affected, and very few improvements to that road are planned.

This will affect not only the people living in the area but also local wildlife. Natural England addressed this issue in: 'The ecological effects of air pollution from road transport' (2016) which states that: "Biodiversity 2020 identifies air pollution as a direct threat to biodiversity in England. Many habitats of nature conservation importance in the UK are adapted to low nutrient conditions and/or are vulnerable to acidification, and are sensitive to additional airborne nitrogen oxides (NOx), sulphur dioxide (SO2) and ammonia (NH3), as well as to nitrogen deposition and acid deposition." In addition, noise from traffic can result in hearing loss in animals. It masks important environmental clues and animal signals. It can result in stress and induce behavioural effects, such as abandonment of territory. With regard to light, predators use light to hunt, and prey species use darkness as cover. Thus increased light at night alters the predator/prey balance and can also affect breeding behaviour in many species.

The environment and the wildlife in and around the four designated SNCIs on the A323 in Normandy i.e. Wyke Churchyard SNCI, Normandy Common SNCI, Wanborough and Normandy Woods SNCI (northernmost wood) and Wyke School Woods SNCI, all of which border the road, will be adversely affected by increased traffic and associated pollution. The UK BAP Traditional Orchard Habitat in Glaziers Lane will also be affected.

Another road where traffic will also be significantly increased is the A324. This borders the TBH SPA and increased traffic and pollution will therefore have an adverse effect on the heathland.

The increase in volume of traffic resulting from the proposed A46 development will reduce biodiversity and harm wildlife. The transport strategy for the area does nothing to mitigate for this and does little to reduce the number of additional motorised vehicles on the roads around the site. I therefore object to the proposed A46 on these grounds.

**Impact of the proposed density of housing and Policy D4**

A large development such as proposed for site A46, with urban housing density, will impact significantly on wildlife within the ancient woodland and veteran trees on the site. The damage to both the environment and its wildlife would be immeasurable regardless of whether buffer zones are put in place.

Not only would the woodland wildlife on the site be harmed, but also wildlife in the woodland next to the site, i.e. the North end of Walden's Copse and Pussey's Copse. Furthermore, it is very important not to break the canopy in any of the existing connections between these woodlands for fear of wildlife isolation. Dormice, for example, do not often like to come down to the ground preferring to move through the canopy.

With the proposed development will come cars, noise, light and air pollution all of which are hazardous to wildlife. As well as increased human activity, there are likely to be approximately 187 extra cats in the area, cat ownership currently being 17 out of 100 households, together with a large number of dogs (see section 2.4.1. above). These animals would undoubtedly have a serious impact on the wildlife of the woodland areas no matter how well the woodland are protected by fencing for example (it is well known that people cut fencing to facilitate access).

The elimination of farmland on site A46, which has traditionally been used for grazing, would also be disastrous since it provides habitat for a variety of wildlife including hedgehogs (which are seriously in decline), bats, owls, and woodpeckers. The open fields are important hunting grounds for barn owls, which can only hunt over open space, and birds of prey such as red kite, buzzard and kestrel. Bats have been seen to hunt by the avenue of ancient oaks and on the wooded edges.

At present, the majority of houses in the villages of Normandy and Flexford have fairly large gardens, which support large numbers of wildlife species. The increased density in housing will come with gardens of much reduced size. There is also a trend in such housing developments for areas to be paved over for parking. Taken together, this would result in a further reduction in the amount of green space, and the value of the gardens for wildlife declines.
GBC are of the opinion that the size of garden is irrelevant when it comes to maintaining biodiversity (see answer given by GBC to question 26 at the meeting organised by Normandy Parish Council on 24 February 2016). This is incorrect. According to an internet article compiled by Ken Thompson and Steve Head, entitled ‘Gardens as a resource for wildlife’ (Wildlife Gardening Forum) it has been shown that total vegetation is a major determinant of diversity and abundance of wildlife. In this article the potential national significance of gardens as a resource for wildlife is clear, but that as garden size decreases, the area occupied by trees, hedges and tall shrubs also declines, with a resulting decline in biodiversity.

Policy D4 anticipates that new possible development sites will be proposed in inset villages (which will include Normandy and Flexford if the Plan is adopted) in addition to current site locations. Whilst they state that they aim to protect the important character of these inset villages using other development management policies, it is inevitable that any such development, if granted, will further increase housing density, with greater impacts on wildlife (as above).

GBC state in the Plan that they have a responsibility to use natural resources, such as land, wisely. They are of the view that increasing densities of housing is one such wise use of land, because it makes development more sustainable. However they fail to take account of the impact of such development on wildlife and the environment, both within the proposed development site and on statutory and non-statutory designated sites in and around Normandy and Flexford. I therefore object to the development proposed on Site A4 on these grounds.

The majority of the site covered by this part of the development is designated as an SNCI and lies within an area identified as a ‘Water Vole Alert Area’ as identified by the National Water Vole Database and Mapping Project in 2012.

It is shocking that GBC would ever consider an SNCI a suitable site for development, particularly given the statements in the NPPF (Para 109) and the Council’s own Policy 14 as set out in section 2.1 and 2.2 above. We find it a telling insight into the very low value that GBC places on biodiversity and wildlife. I strongly object to policy A46 on these grounds.

2.6 I object to Policy A46 on the grounds that there is no proven need for a secondary school in Site A46. Secondary schools to the west of the Borough are under subscribed by 736. Another 480 places will available at the new Technical College (2018) and there are approved expansions at Guildford County and St. Peters. The New Hoe Valley school will have 120 places available per year, 25 places this year not taken.

The Land Availability Assessment (LAA) projections show there will be no identified ‘need’ for a school for the first 5 years of construction of 450 homes. An application for housing and a secondary school has been submitted for the development at Rokers, Worplesdon.

There has been no proper assessment of whether alternative sites could accommodate the school, as is clearly required given the “exceptional circumstances” test. GBC’s assessment of alternative secondary school sites notes that Surrey County Council’s concerns as to remoteness of the site from development areas was only overcome by the new housing provision in the Local Plan – i.e. that housing which is proposed on this site. The alternatives assessment fails to identify the land area required for the school, and fails to assess alternative sites on the basis of their contribution (or otherwise) to the Green Belt. This is a fundamentally flawed sequential assessment.

Even if this site is the only possible school site (which is not accepted) then there is no explanation as to why 1,100 houses are required to be delivered in addition to the school, with a materially greater impact on the Green Belt and the environment generally. Part of the justification offered for the selection of this site for a school is that it is close to the proposed housing (together with other development sites). This argument is circular, since if the school is not required in this location then nor is the housing. In any event, this justification does not compare alternative sites on a fair basis, since other sites are rejected for schools on the basis of their Green Belt location. This site also lies within the Green Belt.

2.7 Lack of consistency of approach on ‘Sustainability’ versus ‘Sensitivity’

Two of the key concepts that underpin the Plan are ‘sustainability’ (i.e. an areas suitability for development - Policy 1) and ‘sensitivity’ (its importance in terms of protecting the Green Belt). Individual settlements are ranked on both counts, and development is favoured in the most ‘sustainable’ ones; conversely, the barrier is higher in the most ‘sensitive ’ones. What is significant is that for the purposes of assessing ‘sustainability’ Normandy and Flexford have been treat as one settlement, whereas for ‘sensitivity’ they have been treated separately. This is simply inconsistent. In fact the original data (used in the first consultation)
identified Normandy as one settlement. The data was rewritten in 2014 dividing the settlements in two. It is not appropriate to alter data in this way.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8068  Respondent: 15709153 / Heather Sohl  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Local Plan 2014 did not propose site A46 be allocated for development. Since then there has been no further Green Belt review, but there has been a Green Belt Purposes Assessment which identified this site as particularly sensitive in Green Belt terms.

I object on the grounds that A46 was not proposed or considered as a strategic site in the first consultation of the Local Plan.

In conclusion, I feel strongly that the draft Local Plan does not meet sufficient standards to justify the proposed development at Sites A46 and A47, as detailed above, and therefore object to this Local Plan. Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2910  Respondent: 15709153 / Heather Sohl  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I support the removal of site A46 from the Local Plan. My previous submission to the Local Plan 2016 included reasons for my objection to the inclusion of this site, as there would be significant biodiversity loss if this development had proceeded, including to the Special Protection Area of the Thames Heaths Basin.

I support the removal of site A47 from the Local Plan. Again, I had objected previously to the inclusion of this site in Local Plan 2016, mainly on the grounds of biodiversity loss given that this is a designated Site of Nature Conservation Importance and therefore of high local wildlife value.

For both of these sites (A46 and A47) the reason for removal from the Local Plan was stated as being because no exceptional circumstances existed to remove this “high sensitivity” land from the Green Belt. This, again, provides greater evidence to the first point in this letter, from the Guildford Borough Council’s own documented rationale, that the insetting of the Green Belt at Flexford and Normandy is completely unjustified.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8073  Respondent: 15710369 / Steve Marshall  Agent:
Impact of increased volumes of traffic on wildlife

If the proposed development goes ahead, there will be an increase in pollution with respect to air quality, noise and light levels, particularly where cars have to queue at junctions or obstructions. The transport strategy proposed by GBC for this strategic site contains no scheduled improvements for Glaziers Lane and very few for Westwood Lane, both rural lanes. The A323 to the north of the site will also be affected, and very few improvements to that road are planned.

This will affect not only the people living in the area but also local wildlife. Natural England addressed this issue in: 'The ecological effects of air pollution from road transport' (2016) which states that: "Biodiversity 2020 identifies air pollution as a direct threat to biodiversity in England. Many habitats of nature conservation importance in the UK are adapted to low nutrient conditions and/or are vulnerable to acidification, and are sensitive to additional airborne nitrogen oxides (NOx), sulphur dioxide (SO2) and ammonia (NH3), as well as to nitrogen deposition and acid deposition." In addition, noise from traffic can result in hearing loss in animals. It masks important environmental clues and animal signals. It can result in stress and induce behavioural effects, such as abandonment of territory. With regard to light, predators use light to hunt, and prey species use darkness as cover. Thus increased light at night alters the predator/prey balance and can also affect breeding behaviour in many species.

The environment and the wildlife in and around the four designated SNCIs on the A323 in Normandy i.e. Wyke Churchyard SNCI, Normandy Common SNCI, Wanborough and Normandy Woods SNCI (northernmost wood) and Wyke School Woods SNCI, all of which border the road, will be adversely affected by increased traffic and associated pollution. The UK BAP Traditional Orchard Habitat in Glaziers Lane will also be affected.

Another road where traffic will also be significantly increased is the A324. This borders the TBH SPA and increased traffic and pollution will therefore have an adverse effect on the heathland.

The increase in volume of traffic resulting from the proposed A46 development will reduce biodiversity and harm wildlife. The transport strategy for the area does nothing to mitigate for this and does little to reduce the number of additional motorised vehicles on the roads around the site. I therefore object to the proposed A46 on these grounds.

Impact of the proposed density of housing and Policy D4

A large development such as proposed for site A46, with urban housing density, will impact significantly on wildlife within the ancient woodland and veteran trees on the site. The damage to both the environment and its wildlife would be immeasurable regardless of whether buffer zones are put in place.

Not only would the woodland wildlife on the site be harmed, but also wildlife in the woodland next to the site, i.e. the North end of Walden's Copse and Pussey's Copse. Furthermore, it is very important not to break the canopy in any of the existing connections between these woodlands for fear of wildlife isolation. Dormice, for example, do not often like to come down to the ground preferring to move through the canopy.

With the proposed development will come cars, noise, light and air pollution all of which are hazardous to wildlife. As well as increased human activity, there are likely to be approximately 187 extra cats in the area, cat ownership currently being 17 out of 100 households, together with a large number of dogs (see section 2.4.1. above). These animals would undoubtedly have a serious impact on the wildlife of the woodland areas no matter how well the woodland are protected by fencing for example (it is well known that people cut fencing to facilitate access).

The elimination of farmland on site A46, which has traditionally been used for grazing, would also be disastrous since it provides habitat for a variety of wildlife including hedgehogs (which are seriously in decline), bats, owls, and woodpeckers. The open fields are important hunting grounds for barn owls, which can only hunt over open space, and
birds of prey such as red kite, buzzard and kestrel. Bats have been seen to hunt by the avenue of ancient oaks and on the wooded edges.

At present, the majority of houses in the villages of Normandy and Flexford have fairly large gardens, which support large numbers of wildlife species. The increased density in housing will come with gardens of much reduced size. There is also a trend in such housing developments for areas to be paved over for parking. Taken together, this would result in a further reduction in the amount of green space, and the value of the gardens for wildlife declines.

GBC are of the opinion that the size of garden is irrelevant when it comes to maintaining biodiversity (see answer given by GBC to question 26 at the meeting organised by Normandy Parish Council on 24 February 2016). This is incorrect. According to an internet article compiled by Ken Thompson and Steve Head, entitled 'Gardens as a resource for wildlife' (Wildlife Gardening Forum) it has been shown that total vegetation is a major determinant of diversity and abundance of wildlife. In this article the potential national significance of gardens as a resource for wildlife is clear, but that as garden size decreases, the area occupied by trees, hedges and tall shrubs also declines, with a resulting decline in biodiversity.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
this location then nor is the housing. In any event, this justification does not compare alternative sites on a fair basis, since other sites are rejected for schools on the basis of their Green Belt location. This site also lies within the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7760  Respondent: 15746081 / Highways England (Patrick Blake)  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

[Highways England made a formal representation on 18 July 2016. See the first attachment for this representation including comments on this element of the consultation documents and/or associated evidence base.

Highways England made further comments on 5 October 2016 following a clarification meeting with Guildford Borough Council. See the second attachment for this letter.]

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?


---

Comment ID: pslp172/5438  Respondent: 15746081 / Highways England (Patrick Blake)  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY A46: LAND TO THE SOUTH OF NORMANDY AND NORTH OF FLEXFORD

Highways England notes this policy has been removed in the 2017 Local Plan and as such our comments on this Policy included within our letter dated 5 October 2016 are to be withdrawn.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1095  Respondent: 17241889 / John Hackney  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.
With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become even more biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3986  Respondent: 17243169 / RSPB (Chloe Rose)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The RSPB notes the removal of Policy A46 for a significant allocation of 1,100 houses. We note that this site lies approximately 750m away from the SPA, with the southern end of the site lying approximately 2000m from the SPA. The RSPB has been unable to identify the reasons why this site has been removed and the allocation of Wisley airfield has been retained. Without this information we consider, when linked to our concerns about the approach to assessing alternatives highlighted in relation to allocation A35, that the plan is not sound, as it is not justified – there is no evidence to demonstrate that the strategy that the Council has adopted is the most appropriate one when considered against reasonable alternatives.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1197  Respondent: 17247105 / Brian & Sandra Grainger  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Ref sites A46 and A47

As residents of Normandy we are very relieved to see that sites A46 and A47 are no longer earmarked for large scale development in the new Local Plan. The effect on the Village of Normandy would have been a near disaster, not only the influx of hundreds of people, but on the lack of local infrastructure and the geology of this area north of the Hogs Back. We acknowledge that the large scale developments in the neighbouring Rushmoor area with the creation of the "New Town of Wellesley", and proposed developments in Tongham and Ash will affect the traffic on our already overcrowded roads d re pelvicd that Normandy wifi not add further to this problem. This year alone we have seen the chaos wi ou oc1 roads created vh the recent closure of the Hogs Back after the heatwave, and before that the increased traffic incurred during the weekend closures of the M3 motorway.

It is important to the environment to uphold Green Belt areas around Normandy. We have many species of fauna and flora which rely, on the "natural corridors" that are in Normandy to exist and prosper.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp172/1256  Respondent: 17249601 / Penelope Moore  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.

With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become **even more** biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) **are within 3 miles of Send Marsh**, most of them on Green Belt. This is **grossly unfair** on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1358  Respondent: 17256577 / Tina Makin  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.

With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become **even more** biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) **are within 3 miles of Send Marsh**, most of them on Green Belt. This is **grossly unfair** on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1815  Respondent: 17288417 / Ian Dwyer  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Please note that I strongly support the removal of these sites owing to the inability to support the infrastructure. I further object to homes being placed outside the Green belt. It is there to protect out countryside and I object to further travellers being permitted to reside in the area.

Lastly, please ensure the cars for sale at the end of cobbett hill on the grass verge facing Henley park need to be removed. It is not a car showroom.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1874  Respondent: 17290913 / David Grant  Agent:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Removal of site A46 and site A47</strong> - I support the removal of these sites. The local infrastructure is already struggling to cope - road conditions, accessibility, utility supply, drainage, local healthcare, etc. are all strained. Maintaining the greenbelt and not developing in this location is the right thing to do.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Removal from the Green Belt of homes in Guildford Road, northern end of Glaziers Lane, Flexford, Walden Cottages &amp; Palm House Nurseries traveller site</strong> - I object to the removal of these from the Green Belt. The Green Belt is a precious resource and its openness should be protected. There are plenty of other local areas outside of the Greenbelt that could be developed instead.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development around Normandy generally</strong> - the Guildford Road and connecting lanes through Normandy are stretched, particularly at morning and evening times. Further development in the area must be accompanied by improvements to local services and infrastructure. Local schools, healthcare and other facilities, transport (road conditions, Ash railway crossing, etc.) need improvement, and local utilities (power, water, drainage, surface water management, telecom/fibre services, etc.) are all under-capacity and need upgrade if further local development is planned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1904  Respondent: 17291553 / James Hitchings  Agent:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become <strong>even more</strong> biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are <strong>within 3 miles of Send Marsh</strong>, most of them on Green Belt. This is <strong>grossly unfair</strong> on an already overcrowded part of the borough.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2265  Respondent: 17302497 / F Bennett  Agent:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become ever more biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2319  Respondent: 17303745 / Christine M Macnair  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.

With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become ever more biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/5219  Respondent: 17308737 / Crimson Project Management Limited  Agent: (ROBINSON ESCOTT PLANNING LLP) John Escott

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Consultation Draft Guildford Borough Local Plan July 2014 identified a need for a new five form entry secondary school to the north or west of Guildford. A site for the school was proposed to be allocated at Salt Box Road, Guildford. The Regulation 19 submission Draft Local Plan 2016 deleted this proposed allocation.

Instead, a seven form secondary school was proposed to be allocated at a strategic mixed use site at Normandy/Flexford. The revised submission Draft Local Plan 2017 now deletes the Normandy/Flexford allocation and proposes both a new primary school and secondary school on land at Blackwell Farm.

This is now the third site that the Council has proposed for the school. It is acknowledged in the justification for the Blackwell Farm allocation (A26) that the access road to the proposed allocation would have adverse impacts on the AONB and the AGLV which will need to be minimised. It is also accepted that there will be an impact on the A31/A3 junction in advance of delivery of the Highway England A3 Guildford scheme and finally that interventions will also be required to address the potential highway performance issues which would result from the development. Crimson Project Management has recently been refused planning permission for a mixed use development which would include a new educational facility as part of a sustainable urban extension to Fairlands. There were no highway objections to the projection nor any other landscape, ecology or other planning objections that could not be appropriately mitigated.
Neither the school nor any other part of the development would have resulted in adverse impacts on any adjoining neighbour. The development is deliverable now and Guildford Education Partnership would be the delivery partner for the new school. This places the Rokers site in a better position to deliver the required educational infrastructure than any of the sites thus far proposed by the Council. In the circumstances, the Infrastructure Schedule contained at Appendix C should be amended to include provision of a new education facility as either a two form entry primary school with room for expansion of a five form entry secondary school on the Rokers site at Fairlands as part of a new mixed use development to include housing, community uses and sporting facilities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2501  Respondent: 17316257 / Neeley Jackson  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.

With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become even more biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2589  Respondent: 17325665 / Claire Nix  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become even more biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2662  Respondent: 17337249 / Ben Aaronson  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( Yes ), is Legally Compliant? ( Yes )
I wholly agree with the decision to remove site A46.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2774  Respondent: 17357249 / E Turner  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the very unfair balance of the Plan across the borough with the removal of site A46 from the plan (with proposed 1100 homes) and the reduction of housing planned in this version of the plan in other parts of the borough this PLAN has become even more biased against the North East of the borough. OF 11,350 homes proposed 4613 (40.6%) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh and Burnt Common and most area green belt This area will be even more overcrowded, grossly unfair.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2797  Respondent: 17365377 / M Swark  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly support the removal of site A46 1,100 houses etc and site 47 no matter how [illegible word] there is too much traffic up and down Glaziers lane now these roads were not made for such amounts of traffic, also it will have a profound effect on road, sewage, wastewater, electricity supply and Doctors surgeries and I understand this is green belt not for building

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2843  Respondent: 17368353 / Angela Gray  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Firstly, I am very relieved to see the removal of sites A46 and A47 (however very disappointed that a private application has been submitted for this site and I will send a separate objection letter shortly about this).

I object to the Insetting proposed in Normandy and Flexford. What are the exceptional circumstances needed for removing this from the green belt? The openness of this area is very important to see and for our wildlife who need corridors of land to move freely in and not squeezed into small areas where they can’t flourish.
With regard to the Palm House Nurseries (A49) travellers site and Showmen of Whittles Drive (A50) I feel this should remain in the greenbelt and not ‘inset’ and they should not be given permanent status. In respect of Palm House nurseries the travellers set up illegally on that land and in my view should never have been given temporary status as it is going to be difficult to ever move them on.

My biggest worry is the 10,000 or so houses being built within a 10 mile radius of Normandy. Where is the new road infrastructure? I think this area will become gridlocked as it does every time there is an accident on the A3 or A31 in the Guildford area.

Blackwell Farm is a beautiful open site of Agricultural land as you leave Guildford to climb the Hogs Back it is an AONB. The thought of seeing this full of housing horrifies me. It will be the start of Guildford merging with Aldershot. This is prime agricultural land and should remain so in the green belt. It is the fault of the University that own this land that there is such a shortage of family homes in Guildford. Many have been bought up and made into bedsits for thousands of students which I have heard are 80% foreign. If the university had not become so large there would be more housing left in Guildford.

I attended a meeting in Normandy a couple of years ago were Matt Furness said GBC are proposing a tunnel like that at Hindhead for Guildford to help with the dreadful traffic problems on the A3. I don’t think you can begin to think about building on Blackwell Farm until such a tunnel is in place. What with The Royal Surrey Hospital with an A+E department so close to this site plus the Surrey Business Park. Traffic has improved since the new traffic light system has been in operation but if building goes ahead it will be chaos in that area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
• I object that the Policies Map – an important document – is of a scale that makes the detail impossible to
distinguish. One of the sites I am most concerned about – the former A47 land – is completely covered by its
label. Large swathes of green belt cover would also appear to be missing from the map.
• The NPPF states ‘the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence’ (NPPF).
Past verdicts of planning inspectors have declared that Normandy/Flexford green fields (A46) contribute to the
‘openness’ of the Green Belt and a panoramic view of green fields to the Surrey Hills AONB – and indeed
recent assessments are that this area along the south of the Hog’s Back is of sufficient quality to itself be
included with the AONB due to its contribution to views. It is hugely important that this be considered before
removing its protection and permanently losing the character of the area that make it outstanding in a national
context.
• Paragraph 4.3.12 states that "only those villages whose open character makes an important contribution to the
Green Belt should be included in the Green Belt". I contend that the land in both A46 and A47 makes an
unparalleled contribution to the Green Belt which stretches from Guildford in the east to Ash/Tongham in the
west. If this area is inset and built upon in the manner proposed it will be the beginning of urban sprawl across
this stretch of countryside which Green Belt policy was designed to prevent. The Government have indicated
that Green Belt is supposed to be protected, but GBC are trying to justify development in this area when they
themselves designated it as having a 'Red' status under their system for quantifying sensitivity (red being the
most sensitive and least likely to be developed).
• GBC have ignored the other existing value of A46 and A47 in removing the Green Belt protection. This land is
high grade farmland and also includes several Sites of Nature Conservation Importance. All policies on
biodiversity ave been ignored when proposing to inset these areas. The proposals are contrary to the NPPF’s
requirements on biodiversity and the natural environment. In section 11 headed “Conserving and enhancing the
natural environment”, it is stated that planning policy should protect and enhance valued landscapes and
minimise impacts on biodiversity, providing net gains in biodiversity wherever possible to halt the overall
decline in biodiversity, by promoting “the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats,
extological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations…..”. GBC is failing to do
this in several ways in relation to A46 and A47 with no clear justification or evidence given as to why this is the
case. It seems that no consideration has been given to the value of the existing SNCIs, the wider network of
hedges and trees and the fact that all this is within one of Surrey’s Biodiversity Opportunity Areas – despite
Policy 14 seeking to promote exactly these qualities. I object that Guildford has not given biodiversity the full
consideration legally required, in breach not only of these policies but their statutory duty under the NERC Act
2006.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I strongly support the withdrawal of Policies A46 and A47 from the Local Plan, which will help to preserve the hugely valuable ‘openness’ of the settlements included.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

1. Removal of sites A46 & A47

I support the removal of these sites owing to the inability of the existing infrastructure (ie roads, wastewater, sewage, flooding, electricity supply and healthcare) to cope with developments of this magnitude and also that it is Green Belt land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

We are writing in SUPPORT to the removal of sites A46 and A47 from the GBC Local Plan 2017.

Our key points in support of the removal of these 2 sites are:

1. Inability of the infrastructure to cope with the development of this magnitude (roads, wastewater, sewage, flooding, electricity supply and healthcare) and the fact that this is Green Belt land. We object to the removal of Green Belt as it could enable development within this area at a much higher density as this area contributes to the “openness of the Green Belt.”

2. In our 11 years of living at number 28 The Paddocks, we have seen on many occasions the pond (a Roman pond of Special Scientific Interest) on the property of Little Flexford, burst its banks and flooding in bad weather. Also the rear field of the proposed development site and to the east of The Paddocks again floods during bad weather, making its own substantial pond.
If the proposals do not cater for the flooding, the result will be that part, if not all, of the proposed development will flood and/or the excess water will drain into the pond at Little Flexford.

This will not only potentially flood the property known as Little Flexford, but the surrounding properties as well, as this is the lowest point in the area.

With climate change (global warming) becoming such a concern and issue, as consistently pointed out in the media, it surely must be essential and necessary that any new and/or existing homes are not subjected to flooding due to any new development on the land east to The Paddocks.

3. Employment within Normandy. There is an extremely serious lack of employment within Normandy village itself. Small companies don’t have a large workforce – a workforce that drives to Normandy to work for a small company. All medium to large sized companies are based in Guildford, a 6 mile drive, bus ride or train ride.

4. Disproportionate and unsustainable development

5. 100% increase in the number of homes in Normandy that will rip the rural heart our of this village and destroy our rural environment

6. Unsubstantiated claims that this will lead to an improvement in services for existing residents

7. Unconstrained annual house building in Guildford, surrounding local authorities apply constraints to their annual housing number due to their Green Belt, while ours is concreted over

8. The erosion of our green belt and the extinguishing of rural Normandy and Flexford

9. The hamlets of Normandy and Flexford merged into one conurbation with no open spaces in between

10. All this completely developer-led, without any respect for the principles of town and country planning.

11. The destruction of our rural environment.

12. Changing green fields into one large urban sprawl.

13. Adding to creeping suburbanisation of the local area.

14. Destruction of our hedgerows and grasslands, causing the devastation and alarming decline in our bird and bee populations.

15. Loss of valuable pasture and arable farmland; in the last 6 to 7 years the UK has lost over 2000 square kilometres of valuable agricultural land to developers.

16. Urbanisation threatening the rare birds of the Thames Basin Heaths only 1 km away from the proposed development.

17. Urban lighting next to Ancient Woodland, light pollution starkly visible from Surrey Hills AONB.

18. Traffic chaos as indicated by the Surrey County Council traffic simulations.

19. Rushmoor expansion generating huge volumes of commuter journeys from outside the borough through our roads.

20. Compounding traffic congestion in the surrounding road and communities.

21. Vast numbers of homes boxed in by a single lane railway bridge, the junctions on the A323 at Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane.

22. Increasing traffic from homes proposed
23. Our local roads and “A” routes grinding to a halt at peak times with massively increased exhaust pollution of NoX and CO2 threatening the health of our older people and children.

24. Protect the “open” character of Flexford and Normandy.

25. Ignoring past verdicts of planning inspectors that our green fields contribute to the “openness” of the Green Belt.

26. Reduction of environmental damage and a more sustainable future.

27. We need homes to be built on brownfield sites first, more homes to be built in Guildford Town, close to the station and central services. More redundant energy hungry offices in Guildford to be turned into homes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4011  Respondent: 17402625 / R Bhalla  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I thoroughly support the removal of site A46 and site A47. I believe this development is inappropriate: green belt area should mean green belt. Any encroachment will only have an adverse effect entailing such factors as flooding, sewage and particularly the extra traffic which the roads were never designed for.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3280  Respondent: 17405505 / Brian Middleton  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like the removal of sites A46 and A47 from our area development - there is no way at all for these sites to be supported by the current infrastructure in the area and these developments will further deteriorate the area and increase traffic and congestion which is currently out of control.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3284  Respondent: 17405697 / Eric Marie  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I would like the removal of sites A46 and A47 from our area development - there is no way at all for these sites to be supported by the current infrastructure in the area and these developments will further deteriorate the area and increase traffic and congestion which is currently way out of control.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to removing site A46, 1100 homes, from the draft Plan. Like Wisley it is located in Green Belt but unlike Wisley, it is close to a railway station.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3733  Respondent: 17425569 / Jack Cross  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to removing site A46, 1100 homes, from the draft Plan. Like Wisley it is located in Green Belt but unlike Wisley, it is close to a railway station.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3853  Respondent: 17433473 / A Winton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to register my support for the removal of sites A46 and A47, owing to the inability of the infrastructure to cope with developments of this magnitude, i.e. insufficient roads, waste water, sewage, flooding electricity supply and health care and the fact that this is Green Belt land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3854  Respondent: 17433601 / D B Winton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to register my support for the removal of sites A46 and A47, owing to the inability of the infrastructure to cope with developments of this magnitude, i.e. insufficient roads, waste water, sewage, flooding electricity supply and health care and the fact that this is Green Belt land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. **I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.**

With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become *even more* biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are *within 3 miles of Send Marsh*, most of them on Green Belt. This is *grossly unfair* on an already overcrowded part of the borough. Why when connection is so bad on the A3 and surrounding roads in this area are you proposing a possible additional 22,000 cars.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
1. I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.

With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become even more biased against the North East of the borough.

Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt.

This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4023  Respondent: 17444993 / Julian La Lau  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Reference the plans you have for Normandy and surrounding areas I would like to object to some issues.

- Site A46 for 1100 homes and School
- Site A47 for 50 homes

I call for the removal of these plans for a number of reasons including, destruction of wildlife habitat, the inability of the current infrastructure to be able to cope with new demands, (i.e. roads, waste, flooding, sewage, electrical supply and healthcare)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4169  Respondent: 17459617 / Renaissance Classics (Keith Sohl)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A46

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The removal of Site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) has left the Plan even further unbalanced against the North East of the Borough with over 40% of the development proposed in this small area of Green Belt, all within just 3 miles of Send Marsh.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A47 - Land to east of The Paddocks, Flexford
**Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/8292</th>
<th>Respondent: 8591041 / Surrey Wildlife Trust (Mike Waite)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</td>
<td>is Sound? ( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This site includes the Little Flexford SNCI, and is within BOA TBL01 Wanborough to Normandy Woods & Meadows. Development here is therefore likely to be incompatible with BOA objectives (inc. protection of Priority habitats). The Trust reserves objection if this tension cannot be satisfactorily reconciled.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2980</th>
<th>Respondent: 8593537 / Normandy Parish Council (Leslie GA Clarke)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</td>
<td>is Sound? ( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Removal of sites A46 and A47.

We support the removal of these sites from the 2016 Plan. They were strongly opposed by Councillors and residents on the basis that they would have irretrievably destroyed the character of Normandy and Flexford, and would have imposed an impossible burden on the local transport and other infrastructure. We are glad that GBC has taken note of the many objections to these proposed sites, and also of the findings of the revised Sustainability Appraisal 2017, and removed them from the Plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7900</th>
<th>Respondent: 8596673 / Peta Malthouse</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</td>
<td>is Sound? ( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objection to Policy A47 Land to the East of the Paddocks, Flexford**

GBC's consideration for this site says.

The majority of the site is designated as an SNCI. The site lies within an area identified as a ‘Water Vole Alert Area’. These areas were identified by the National Water Vole Database and Mapping Project in 2012.

The Government is committed to halting overall decline in biodiversity. Building on this site does not support this commitment. I am very disappointed that GBC could consider building on an SNCI. Are our natural assets safe in their hands?
Even though it is small, this site will generate additional traffic, when the roads are already at or nearing capacity.

NPPF 109 point 3 refers.

Again no exceptional circumstances are put forward to justify this

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Site A47 Land East of The Paddocks: Homes C3 Quantity 50

This site is on the direct boundary of my home and I strongly object to the inclusion of this site within the plan for these reasons:

From first hand experience I see how easily this site floods. The fields are at saturation levels at all times, even during periods of dry weather. The ditches bordering the fields overflow during the winter and flood water creeps over fields creating large areas of still water; substantial enough for birds and wildlife to sustain new habitats in and the ponies that reside there in dryer months have to be moved to other paddocks. I believe the ground saturation levels would not be suitable for development. If built on where would the water drain to? Our garden floods in the wet weather already.

Amongst the various wildlife I’ve seen, is a pair of Egrets, which are rarely sighted away from Poole and Chichester Harbours. Bats roost nearby as every evening at dusk we see them fly from the direction of the field around our bungalow and back across the field. They continue this lap many times and my understanding is that they are protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981), which states it is an offence to intentionally disturb a roost. We also see Hedgehogs, Badgers, Common Toads, Barn Owls and Fieldfares. I am aware that both the Barn Owl and Fieldfare are protected by same legislation the Bat, however the Fieldfare is a migratory bird which arrives in its flocks to this site every Autumn is currently on the RSPB’s Red status list, as well. Any development to this site would not only disturb the fragile ecological status but would irrevocably destroy the fragile habitat of these species in our area.

There are also many mature Oak trees on site A47, one of which is a particular veteran and stands almost central to the site. Flexford borders the site of the Ancient Springs at Wanborough and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty on the Surrey Hills. It is less than 5kms away from the Thames Heath Basin’s Special Protection Area at Ash Ranges. The greenbelt is there to prevent the urban sprawl. Being located 3 miles out of Guildford it is vital to retain the boundary for social and ecological purposes. Previously this was ‘protected greenbelt’, so why has the status changed?

Furthermore, my husband and I chose to buy our home adjacent to this site over any other property we viewed purely because of its location and outlook from the kitchen and garden, not because of size or style or because it was up to a certain stand of living. We moved there 3 years ago and have sacrificed and purchase it. We have invested time and money to have a new boiler and central heating, new electrics and plumbing. The property isn’t large but it will take us many years to complete the renovations whilst there is general maintenance work to pay-out for. We are not seeking to extend. We consider this to be our forever home and would be devastated if we were to be surrounded on all sides by dwellings and our outlook was to change. It would destroy our sanctuary.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
This site lies within a 'Water Vole Alert Area'. It is astonishing that it can be proposed for development, given the
damaging effect on biodiversity this would entail.

The site is regularly flooded; if it is built over it can only contribute to increased flooding in the surrounding area, notably
at Wanborough Station, which is regularly inaccessible after heavy rain. I find it almost inconceivable that anyone could
think it is an appropriate site upon which to build 50 houses.

Access to the site is via a narrow bridge over a stream running from the Hogs Back; this is completely unsuitable for the
additional traffic that 50 houses would create, let alone the construction traffic that would accompany the development.
Immediately after the bridge is a sharp left hand turn that would be almost impossible to negotiate for a low loader
carrying the plant that would be needed for the construction works.

This is a poorly chosen site, not at all within the spirit of the NPPF.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2658  Respondent: 8687041 / Michael Aaronson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A47

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

I strongly support the removal from the Plan of Policy/Site A47. This was in a highly inappropriate location, being both
an SNCI and particularly prone to year-round flooding. It was purely developer-led and was justified solely by virtue of
its proximity to Wanborough Station, which is now no longer to be considered a transport interchange.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1214  Respondent: 8729313 / Lisa Wright  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A47

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

OBJECT. Site is greenbelt and should be protected.

OBJECT, There is no need for a secondary school in the West of Guildford as we have space in Ash Manor and Kings
College. Furthermore, a planning application has just gone in for a secondary school a couple of miles away at Fairlands.

OBJECT to the disturbance of the protected vole.

OBJECT to building on anything that has protection from SNCI

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I support the removal of sites A46 and A47 from the 2017 Plan, which were strongly opposed by Councillors and other Normandy residents due to the fact that they would have significantly and irretrievably destroyed the character of Normandy and Flexford. Additionally, a significant burden would have been placed on the local transport and other infrastructure.

I am pleased that Guildford Borough Council (GBC) have taken note of the many objections to these proposed sites and also of the findings of the revised Sustainability Appraisal 2017 and removed them from the Plan.

With regard to A47, as the reason for this amendment highlighted in the summary of key changes to the Proposed Submission Local Plan, ‘the site continues to meet the criteria for a Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI), which is incompatible with development.’

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
We object to the proposal that the land that contains the majority of an SNCI should be proposed for housing development.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that “The purpose of planning is to help to achieve sustainable development” and it describes three “dimensions” relevant to this aim: economic, social and environmental. The explanation for how the environmental aspect plays a role includes the statement “…..helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently…..” This is a quote from point 7 of the section dealing with achieving sustainable development, in the NPPF.

In the section headed “Conserving and enhancing the natural environment” (section 11), it is stated inter alia that planning policy should protect and enhance valued landscapes and minimize impacts on biodiversity providing net gains in biodiversity wherever possible to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, by promoting “the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations……”.

Guildford Borough Council (GBC) interprets the NPPF through their 'Policy I4' which emphasises the commitment to biodiversity stating: "The Council will conserve and enhance biodiversity and will seek opportunities for habitat restoration and creation, particularly within and adjacent to Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs)").

Proposals for development must demonstrate how they will deliver appropriate net gains in biodiversity. Where proposals fall within or adjacent to a BOA, biodiversity measures should support that BOA’s objectives. The Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) will set out guidance on how this can be achieved. European sites designated as Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), National Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), local SNCIs and Local Nature Reserves are all shown on the Policies Map or as subsequently updated.

Policy I4 goes on to say that "Permission will not be granted for proposals that are likely to materially harm the nature conservation interests of local sites unless clear justification is provided that the need for development clearly outweighs the impact on biodiversity.”

The majority of the site covered by this part of the development is designated as an SNCI and lies within an area identified as a ‘Water Vole Alert Area’ as identified by the National Water Vole Database and Mapping Project in 2012.

It is shocking that an SNCI should be considered a suitable site for development, particularly given the statements in the NPPF (Para 109) and Policy I4. We find it a telling insight into the very low value that GBC places on biodiversity and wildlife.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Water voles are in dire need of help wherever possible as their numbers have dropped enormously over recent years. This stream is ideal for water voles and considerable damage is bound to occur during the development. Urban envelopment of it, even with 'buffer strips', will sound the death knell of vole habitation.

If development is to go ahead I would suggest that land to the east of the stream is taken out of the plans. This area lies wet anyway and is unsuitable. It would however at least keep the stream open on one side. The development to the west of the stream should be kept well away from the stream and arrangements put in place to prevent any pollution.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1006  Respondent: 8848033 / Paul Gerrard  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A47
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

I object to housing on this site. It's Green Belt (NPPF 89). What are the exceptional circumstances that require this site to be developed?

It is a Site of Nature Conservation Interest where NPPF 109 requires the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment.

It is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, and therefore any development is subject to EU/UK legislation (NPPF 119). The impact cannot be mitigated with SANGs because there is no evidence base to support SANGs as required by NRM6 viii, NPPF 158 and 166.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2784  Respondent: 8877697 / Moira Newman  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A47
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to express my views as to the local plan regarding Normandy.

I am in complete agreement with the removal of sites A46 and A47, as these have very poor access and one interferes with a public footpath which would be hemmed in instead of being open, a space accessible to those who live in the area, providing a place for well being and walking, the open air and an area away from traffic.

A47 is an area which is liable to flooding having a stream from Flexford running through it and in some winters, the area has been under 3ft of water. Access is also limited and narrow.

These two sites would exacerbate the amount of traffic in these narrow lanes, detrimental to health and local wildlife.

I see that a part of Normandy has been [illegible word] from the Green Belt, including homes in Guildford Rd, the northern end of Glaziers Lane, Flexford, Walden Cottages and Palm House Nurseries.
None of these places is suitable for housing. The access is small, [illegible word] too narrow and the whole [illegible world] become a place of traffic pollution, another green lung taken out of the surrounding area of Guildford.

The infrastructure required to make this work and the traffic to flow is not very feasible in This area as the only real [illegible word] road is the A3 which already is overloaded at rush hour times and can cause great problems when accidents occur. The A31 fares no better. From Normandy one can see the traffic [illegible word] to tail along its length and this would be made even worse.

No doubt the homes built would lack anywhere other thats the drive to park the car and children have nowhere to play in a garden. All most homes seem to have these days is the minimum of a square of grass at the rear of the property.

All in all this area is not conducive to such a large number of homes being built as the infrastructure, just is not there to take the additional volume of traffic. I therefore object to this Local Plan, as it will also affect the “openness of the Green Belt.” The Green Belt is there as a safety net that we may all enjoy some open space in our surroundings. It should not be reduced of “whittled away”.

The place to build is on brownfield sites and these must be identified and used instead of denying the surrounding area its “green lungs” for the enjoyment of all residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to register my support of Guildford Borough Council's (GBC) decision to remove site A46 (land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford) and A47 (land to the east of the Paddocks, Flexford) from the 2017 Local Plan. It is reassuring that GBC has acknowledged that this land is Green Belt and that the infrastructure - roads wastewater, sewage, power supply and healthcare could not support such extensive development. Prior to the development of sites remaining in the local plan, it is essential that GBC implement improvements, to ease traffic congestion, such as the new road bridge and footbridge at Ash station to permit removal of the level crossing (ref. LRN21) in advance of building.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2240</th>
<th>Respondent: 8893697 / Gill Woolfson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Objection to Policy A47 Land to the East of the Paddocks, Flexford

This site is not sustainable as it builds on an SNCI, has not defensible borders, damages GBC's natural capital and requires an infrastructure that is not there. GBC's consideration for this site says. The majority of the site is designated as an SNCI. The site lies within an area identified as a ‘Water Vole Alert Area’. These areas were identified by the National Water Vole Database and Mapping Project in 2012.

The Government is committed to halting overall decline in biodiversity, as is GBC. Building on this site does not support these commitments. I am very disappointed that GBC could consider building on an SNCI.

Opportunities exist in Wider Normandy to promote its natural capital, the seven SNCIs and the heathland slopes south of the SPA. Publicity, site information boards and leaflets, improvement of some paths for disabled access, activities such as pond dipping and promoting the tea shop at The Therapy Garden would provide an excellent way for families to engage with nature. Little Flexford would be part of this. The Friends of Normandy Wildlife are already organising nature walks on Normandy Common, pond dipping in the Traditional Orchard, and together with the Trustees of Normandy Pond, signage and leaflets. A Bat walk on the footpath that crosses site A46 have been successful and well supported. GBC should exploit the natural capital in Normandy, rather than build on it.

The borders of the site to the south and east are not defensible.

Cars from this site will have to use Flexford Lane, a narrow road, which floods at the bridge where the Wanborough Spring comes from the Hog’s Back when the weather is wet. There are no planned improvements to Flexford Road. There is no opportunity to travel by train (see A46), by bike or on foot. Without Green Travel options, A47 is not sustainable.

NPPF 109 point 3 refers.

SUMMARY

Examples of confused and contradictory thinking.

- GBC state that the Town Centre is the most sustainable location to build. The majority of development in is the Green Belt
- GBC state that they will focus on brownfield development; the majority of building is on greenfield sites in the Green Belt.
• GBC make a priority of Biodiversity. Policy A47 plans to build on an SNCI. The amount of green space is the Borough is reduced by 218ha.
• GBC’s policy is infrastructure first, development later. Policy A46 - the developer hopes to deliver in 1-5 years. The infrastructure improvements, minor as they are, will not start until 2021.
• GBC states that they will work with neighbouring Boroughs as the Duty to Co-operate requires. The first commuters from the AUE (Rushmoor) will use the A323 from 2016. Improvements to the A323 start later.
• Policy D3 states that it will "enhance the special interest, character and significance of the borough’s heritage assets and their settings and make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness." A46 will affect 8 Grade II listed buildings; two of them will suffer significant harm.
• Policy P1 states that GBC will "conserve and/or enhance the setting and views of the AONB". However, it will spoil the view from the Hog’s Back (A46), and is contemplating driving a road through it (A26).

To be credible, GBC need to set out policies and then meet them.

There are inconsistencies. Policy A36 has a requirement to ensure the Grade II listed building on the site is not harmed. Policy A46 has no requirement to mitigate the harm to the Grade II listed buildings by the site, one within 25m.

I have only commented on issues where I think I can add value. As a result I do not know other areas in the Plan are more sound that the ones that I have looked at. However, judging from reaction from other Guildford residents I suspect not, in which case there is a question mark over the soundness of the whole Plan.

ANNEX A

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3302  Respondent: 8893697 / Gill Woolfson  Agent: 8893697
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A47
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I support the removal of site A47, land in Flexford, from the plan. I am pleased to see that Guildford Borough Council respects the SNCI status of this land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2251  Respondent: 8898241 / Christine Wilks  Agent: 8898241
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A47
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Agree with Amendment 2 Removal of Site Allocation A47 regards 50 proposed houses in Flexford

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3712</th>
<th>Respondent: 8901825 / Raymond Woolfson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I object to Policy A47.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3719</th>
<th>Respondent: 8901825 / Raymond Woolfson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. A47 - Legal basis for its plans to build on Green Belt land, nor explained why only Green Belt land selected,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3681</th>
<th>Respondent: 8926529 / Annie Cross</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy A47 – Land east of The Paddocks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object: to this site being excluded from the current draft Plan. 50 houses alongside a village is sustainable and not disproportionate to the size of the village. Removing this site means other proposed sites must take up this shortfall.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4188</th>
<th>Respondent: 8933185 / Peter See</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 232, Policy A47: Land to the East of The Paddocks, Flexford
Objection
"There will be too many homes (approx 50). Density will be too high."
encourage pedestrian access: provide attractive and safe pedestrian and cyclist access

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/476  Respondent: 10655201 / Robert Owen  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A47

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There is a public footpath through this site which will need to be protected. It leads to an unprotected crossing of the railway. Housing close by is likely to encourage use of this crossing and increase the risk of accidents to users and those who see the railway as a playground. This site is always boggy and is prone to flooding. The pond has historic value as it is part of the falx making process from which Flexford got its name. The road access through the Paddocks and the narrow partially made track alongside the proposed site are inadequate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/740  Respondent: 10795553 / Valerie A Chant  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A47

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have to hand a letter from yourselves dated 6 October 15, saying quite clearly 'we will need to take account of constraints...GREEN BELT, FLOODING, LANDSCAPE & INFRASTRUCTURE  such transport...'

At the April 13th GBC Planning Meeting, Normandy I named as a 'strategic site' when only 6 weeks. We were assured that this land between Flexford and Normandy had red sensitivity.

I see too that you wish us to have a '60 bedroom Nursing Home'. We want neither the Nursing Home nor the volume of traffic' it would generate. Please stop allowing bungalows to be ruined by building a second thus rendering them unsuitable for elderly residents who also not wish to leave the village, yet are perfectly able to live alone and have neither need or wish for a nursing home. People who wish for a house should not buy a Bungalow!!!

Retail space? Do not bother. Normandy had many shops but one by one they have closed because everything is cheaper in town or on line.

Transport - have you, in the past few years had a hospital; or other appointment for 9am? Unless you leave Normandy at 7.30 you will be late!

As you can see, I live in the Paddocks, I am disabled, my Doctors Surgery is at the lower end of Glaziers Lane. I have a buggy but dare not try to go to the surgery in this. There is, until past the surgery, only 1 footpath in Glaziers Lane, either on the east or the west side, involving crossing the road twice at the two most dangerous points, one on a blind bend with no lowered kerb, the other close to the north side of the railway bridge where traffic speeding from the south side just does not see you until they are on top of you - oh - the pavement of the north side of the bridge is slipping away and tries to tip you over. The traffic is bad at the moment (sat no directions). We cannot cope with more traffic!
Six traveller pitches - be fair! We already have more than our share - who incidentally, flout your rules constantly.

Secondary School for 1500 students! Why? We all are well aware that the existing local schools are under subscribed. Are they to hold classes overnight? They won't be on time for 9 O'Clock. Extended railway station car park - I suggest an airfield would be more [text unreadable] then there would be much more hope of arriving on time.

1,100 new homes! Choke the Green Belt between 3 Hamlets! I fully realise that people need homes but in the Guildford area there are many other villages, hamlets and areas of scrub land (not nature habitats) that could well share the burden of development. I am also aware that developers want arable land, not scrub land as it is much more profitable, but what happens when oil runs out and food is not so cheap to transport? We shall need arable land.

I am very concerned that these plans were made public so close to the time that we were assured that we were a 'Red Preservation Area' in the Green Belt, forcing us all to believe that negotiations were already taking place with Taylor Wimpey.

Finally, a village green! How dare Taylor Wimpey or yourselves imply that such a thing is necessary, Normandy has a very friendly community and many times during the year we have organised events on our excellent village green, including the excellent children play area. It seems that what it being planned is not just Normandy taking a fair share of development but (considering the meaning of the word 'rape' means inserting a foreign body into an unwilling recipient) the 'rape' of Normandy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/742  Respondent: 10795553 / Valerie A Chant  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A47
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

For your letter of 25 May.

Yes, of course, I wish this letter - (accompanying photocopy) to be a formal response that is passed to the planning inspector considering your proposed plan and to any further planning meeting that may be relevant.

I do not wish to speak in person but wish my written word to speak for me.

Finally I would like to stress the point that the site in question was not safeguarded so how is it threatened for development:- a 'red' area of the 'GREENBELT - NOT SAFEGUARDED???'

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7941  Respondent: 10799425 / Guildford Greenbelt Group (Susan Parker)  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A47
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1 Policy A47 – Land west of The Paddocks, Normandy
Response – GGG objects to this policy

Do you consider this section of the plan legally compliant? NO
Do you consider this section of the plan is sound? NO
Do you consider this section of the document complies with the Duty to Cooperate? YES

We object to the proposal that the land that contains the majority of an SNCI should be proposed for housing development.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that “The purpose of planning is to help to achieve sustainable development” and it describes three “dimensions” relevant to this aim: economic, social and environmental. The explanation for how the environmental aspect plays a role includes the statement “…..helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently…..” This is a quote from point 7 of the section dealing with achieving sustainable development, in the NPPF.

In the section headed “Conserving and enhancing the natural environment” (section 11), it is stated inter alia that planning policy should protect and enhance valued landscapes and minimize impacts on biodiversity providing net gains in biodiversity wherever possible to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, by promoting “the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations…..”.

Guildford Borough Council (GBC) interprets the NPPF through their ‘Policy I4’ which emphasises the commitment to biodiversity stating: “The Council will conserve and enhance biodiversity and will seek opportunities for habitat restoration and creation, particularly within and adjacent to Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs)”.

Proposals for development must demonstrate how they will deliver appropriate net gains in biodiversity. Where proposals fall within or adjacent to a BOA, biodiversity measures should support that BOA’s objectives. The Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) will set out guidance on how this can be achieved. European sites designated as Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), National Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), local SNCIs and Local Nature Reserves are all shown on the Policies Map or as subsequently updated.

Policy I4 goes on to say that "Permission will not be granted for proposals that are likely to materially harm the nature conservation interests of local sites unless clear justification is provided that the need for development clearly outweighs the impact on biodiversity."

The majority of the site covered by this part of the development is designated as an SNCI and lies within an area identified as a ‘Water Vole Alert Area’ as identified by the National Water Vole Database and Mapping Project in 2012.

It is shocking that an SNCI should be considered a suitable site for development, particularly given the statements in the NPPF (Para 109) and Policy I4. We find it a telling insight into the very low value that GBC places on biodiversity and wildlife.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3428  Respondent: 10847585 / Sean Meharg  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A47
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Land to East of The Paddocks, Flexford

I object to the above two sites because, apart from being green belt land that should continue to be protected, they are entirely unsuited for development, for the following reasons:

1. Both are subject to flooding, which would be obvious to anyone who has visited the sites, particularly after heavy rain. I regularly walk along FP361 (through Site A46) and FP375 (through Site A47). Any measures adopted to prevent flooding of the proposed new developments would simply cause the flooding risk to be moved to other locations, including my property.
2. The infrastructure of the area cannot cope with the current situation, never mind with the extra pressures from an additional 1100+ homes and a school, as witnessed by anyone who is familiar with the village:
3. Regular power outages.
4. Flooding from existing sewers at times of high rainfall.
5. Subsidence of existing roads, including the collapse of manholes.
6. Narrow roads, with hazardous 90 degree bends (on Westwood Lane leading to Wanborough and at the Glaziers Lane/Flexford Road junction) that are already the scene of several accidents.
7. Inadequate lighting on existing roads. These developments would result in even more dangerous conditions for both drivers and pedestrians.
8. Restrictions at the existing railway crossings:
9. Single lane traffic only at the Westwood Lane underbridge, with a height restriction stopping large vehicles from using that route.
10. Settlement behind abutments at Glaziers Lane overbridge (probably as a result of large vehicles being unable to use the Westwood Lane underbridge), with hazardous, blind approaches set at an angle to the road alignment.
11. Traffic congestion at the top of Wanborough Hill and junctions with the A31 sliproads resulting in long delays, whether leaving or approaching the area.
12. Traffic congestion tailing back along the A323 Guildford Road, sometimes from as far away as the level crossing at Ash railway station. This can be particularly severe, in the event of an accident on the A31.
13. Specifically applicable to Site A46, where there is currently no need for a school within the Normandy area. The adjacent schools, at Ash Manor School in Ash and Kings College in Park Barn are both currently under-subscribed and, should the situation change at some point in the future, have expansion capacity within their existing sites.
14. Ecologically, I do not feel the need to reiterate how these developments would affect the local environment, as other residents, with more detailed knowledge than I, will be able to put forward a much better case, other than to say that I specifically moved to Normandy because of its rural surroundings and access to green field walks.

Finally, it would appear that little or no research was carried out to establish whether these sites were really appropriate for development. I would therefore urge you to look again at their suitability and reject these proposals.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3344</th>
<th>Respondent: 10861569 / Christine Read</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I SUPPORT the proposal to remove this site from the Local Plan as it is on Green Belt land and also the village infrastructure cannot support such high density developments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3063</th>
<th>Respondent: 10903009 / Ann Messer</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local plan consultation for sites A46 and A47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am delighted that the above sites for a major development project have been removed from the Local Plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1250</th>
<th>Respondent: 10911201 / Claire Walker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( No ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to policy A47. This land should not be built on. It floods over about half of it for nearly six months of the year. This maybe why it's designated as an SNCI and a Water Vole Alert Area. Buffer strips along the edge of the stream are hardly going to mitigate the impact of building 50 homes on this site. There is also a public footpath which will need to be maintained therefore causing more disruption to the wildlife.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3861</th>
<th>Respondent: 10911201 / Claire Walker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wholeheartedly support the removal of the proposals for Site A47 from the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A47 support of removal from plan. Following my earlier response to site A47, the proposed building on Green Belt in Normandy, I strongly support the removal of Sites A47 from the Local Plan owing to the inability of the infrastructure, particularly transport, health and environmental, to cope with these scales of development. The sites proximity to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area À protected area also makes the removal particularly welcome in order to protect this key habitat.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Policy A47 – Land west of The Paddocks, Normandy
I object to Policy A47
I object to the proposal that the land that contains the majority of an SNCI should be proposed for housing development.
In the section headed “Conserving and enhancing the natural environment” (section 11), it is stated inter alia that planning policy should protect and enhance valued landscapes and minimize impacts on biodiversity providing net gains in biodiversity wherever possible to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, by promoting “the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations…..”.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that “The purpose of planning is to help to achieve sustainable development” and it describes three “dimensions” relevant to this aim: economic, social and environmental. The explanation for how the environmental aspect plays a role includes the statement “…..helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently…..” This is a quote from point 7 of the section dealing with achieving sustainable development, in the NPPF.

Guildford Borough Council (GBC) interprets the NPPF through their 'Policy I4' which emphasises the commitment to biodiversity stating: "The Council will conserve and enhance biodiversity and will seek opportunities for habitat restoration and creation, particularly within and adjacent to Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs)".

Proposals for development must demonstrate how they will deliver appropriate net gains in biodiversity. Where proposals fall within or adjacent to a BOA, biodiversity measures should support that BOA’s objectives. The Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) will set out guidance on how this can be achieved. European sites designated as Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), National Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), local SNCIs and Local Nature Reserves are all shown on the Policies Map or as subsequently updated. Policy I4 goes on to say that "Permission will not be granted for proposals that are likely to
materially harm the nature conservation interests of local sites unless clear justification is provided that the need for development clearly outweighs the impact on biodiversity."
The majority of the site covered by this part of the development is designated as an SNCI and lies within an area identified as a ‘Water Vole Alert Area’ as identified by the National Water Vole Database and Mapping Project in 2012.
It is shocking that an SNCI should be considered a suitable site for development, particularly given the statements in the NPPF (Para 109) and Policy I4. I find it a telling insight into the very low value that GBC places on biodiversity and wildlife.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4010  Respondent: 11023233 / Alex Campbell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A47

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Removal of sites A46 & A47 & 10,000 additional homes within 10mile radius of Normandy

a. General Points:

1. It is my understanding GBC Planning should be directed primarily towards the community it serves. Therefore any planning proposal should be initially filtered against whether or not there is benefit to the affected community & residents
2. Dissolving or removing Green Belt status from any such area where previously it was believed to be justified – is not a benefit, and should be resisted. Moving” goalposts” around is unfair play.
3. Current Proposals are contrary to the GBC proud boast of “SURREY HILL’S OUTSTANDING BEAUTY”

CONGESTION

Congestion is already dreadful on this section of the A323 during peak hours, and these developments will undoubtedly result in gridlock, as (1,100+50 as part of 10,000) homes with the demographic of mainly young working couples with 2 children with each household having mostly 2 vehicles with adults needing cars for school run and work commute. This will give rise to approximately 21,000 additional cars (twice a day) somehow trying to thread their way) into the Guildford/Aldershot directions of the A323. Resultant queues will become legendary, and stationary car fumes/pollution will affect the whole neighbourhood adversely.

“Policy G5 (8) Traffic, Parking and Design: The visual impact of traffic and associated access and parking is minimised, especially in sensitive locations”

c. NOISE

The noise of so many stationary vehicles with engines running (and often car audio systems blaring) will also impact each of the homes on the Guildford Road. Even without this development, I am unable to sit in my front garden, or to open any of the windows facing south towards the road.

d. GREEN BELT

Such developments represent a clear violation of the Green Belt Policy which is/was in operation in this area to protect our neighbourhood and to preserve its rural aspect.
“Brown Field” sites should be targeted instead.

e. SAFETY

Increased danger to children, as there will be several hundred more, all requiring access of one sort or another to the
already busy A323 Guildford Road. There are currently no traffic lights or safe island crossings on my part of the
Guildford Road, and so the incidence of fatalities will increase. Even if these were to be put in place, then the additional
congestion would be UNTHINKABLE – making the whole scheme UNWORKABLE!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/757  Respondent: 15237473 / Andrew Parker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A47

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

The plan, ref A47, proposes 50 new dwellings next to the railway with no direct access to a main road. This will create a
big increase in traffic through a quiet residential cul de sac street which is currently only designed to serve the 30 existing
houses. Any proposed development of this size requires direct and simple access to main roads and is inappropriately
placed within a residential area. The Paddocks is already a site of 30 houses and to increase it by a further 50 houses will
disrupt access to the existing houses and this busy road will risk injury to the elderly people that live in the sheltered
housing which opens on to the road. In short this plan proposes to turn a quiet, safe cul de sac into a dangerous access
road.

This site is area of natural beauty with diverse wildlife next to the Christmas Pie way and this development will destroy
the essential habitats of this wildlife.

This wildlife is preserved by waterways and casual water which floods the area every year. Building on this site will
require substantial drainage, which will kill this water dependent wildlife, including the water voles. Has the appropriate
research and assessment been carried out to ensure that the required drainage will not impact the existing wildlife? I
would like to see evidence of the due process undertaken to measure this impact.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1074  Respondent: 15263873 / Paul van den Bosch  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A47

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

I object to this proposed development as it will greatly increase the volume of traffic on roads which are rural and often
used for recreation. The siting of this development will lead to large numbers of vehicles in West Flexford Lane and
Flexford Road. The planning document mentions access to the station which is of course important but no household in
this area will be without a car and the unpaved roads on which children may walk to buses and the station will be
significant less safe as well as the large number of ramblers who use these routes.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2629  
**Respondent:** 15264065 / Roshan Bailey  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A47

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wholeheartedly support the removal of the proposals for Site A47 from the Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4137  
**Respondent:** 15274049 / Simon Gimson  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A47

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I support the withdrawal of policies A47 and A48 and I hope that the land North of the railway between Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane will be protected for the long term.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2671  
**Respondent:** 15278689 / F Robertson  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A47

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Very pleased to see this land, which floods regularly and has water voles present on it, removed from the local plan and no longer considered suitable for building. A site of nature conservation interest shouldn't be used this way and it was wrong to consider it in the first place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2986  
**Respondent:** 15299169 / Laurel Kitchen  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A47

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
My objections to A47 plans Which have been resubmitted for approval by Guildford Borough Council.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1365  Respondent: 15299233 / Alan Le Jeune  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A47
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Whilst I recognise the need for more housing in Guildford, i strongly believe building in Normandy is not the best option. It will create considerable traffic jams, damage the green belt countryside and wildlife and ruin what is now a nice village. I strongly recommend that this proposal be scrapped and a more suitable site be considered.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2193  Respondent: 15371361 / Friends of Normandy Wildlife (Alistair Lawson)  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A47
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3.2 Impact of Policy A47

The majority of the site covered by this part of the development is designated as an SNCI and lies within an area identified as a 'Water Vole Alert Area' as identified by the National Water Vole Database and Mapping Project in 2012.

It is shocking that GBC would ever consider an SNCI a suitable site for development, particularly given the statements in the NPPF (Para 109) and the Council's own Policy 14 as set out in section 2.1 and 2.2 above. We find it a telling insight into the very low value that GBC places on Biodiversity and wildlife.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2516  Respondent: 15400833 / William John Scott  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A47
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A46. A47. A50.

The Green Belt is protected as a matter of national and local policy and I object to GBC’s proposal to build houses etc on it going against previous public consultations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1242</th>
<th>Respondent: 15406145 / Paul Moore</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.

With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become even more biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3230</th>
<th>Respondent: 15408001 / Lesley Bond</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I support the withdrawl of Policy A47

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3786</th>
<th>Respondent: 15460801 / Melanie Williams</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I write to object to the proposed development of Sites A46 and A47 in the GBC Local Plan.

I am a resident of Normandy, of 27 The Paddocks.

Site A47 Land East of The Paddocks: Homes C3 Quantity 50

This site is on the direct boundary of my home and I strongly object to the inclusion of this site within the plan for these reason:
From first hand experience I see how easily this site floods. The fields are at saturation levels at all times, even during periods of dry weather. The ditches bordering the fields overflow during the winter and flood water creeps over fields creating large areas of still water; substantial enough for birds and wildlife to sustain new habitats in and the ponies that reside there in dryer months have to be moved to other paddocks. I believe the ground saturation levels would not be suitable for development. If built on where would the water drain to? Our garden floods in the wet weather already.

Amongst the various wildlife I’ve seen, is a pair of Egrets, which are rarely sighted away from Poole and Chichester Harbours. Bats roost nearby as every evening at dusk we see them fly from the direction of the field around our bungalow and back across the field. They continue this lap many times and my understanding is that they are protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981), which states it is an offence to intentionally disturb a roost. We also see Hedgehogs, Badgers, Common Toads, Barn Owls and Fieldfares. I am aware that both the Barn Owl and Fieldfare are protected by same legislation the Bat, however the Fieldfare is a migratory bird which arrives in its flocks to this site every Autumn is currently on the RSPB’s Red status list, as well. Any development to this site would not only disturb the fragile ecological status but would irrevocably destroy the fragile habitat of these species in our area.

There are also many mature Oak trees on site A47, one of which is a particular veteran and stands almost central to the site. Flexford borders the site of the Ancient Springs at Wanborough and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty on the Surrey Hills. It is less than 5kms away from the Thames Heath Basin’s Special Protection Area at Ash Ranges. The greenbelt is there to prevent the urban sprawl. Being located 3 miles out of Guildford it is vital to retain the boundary for social and ecological purposes. Previously this was ‘protected greenbelt’, so why has the status changed?

Furthermore, my husband and I chose to buy our home adjacent to this site over any other property we viewed purely because of its location and outlook from the kitchen and garden, not because of size or style or because it was up to a certain stand of living. We moved there 3 years ago and have sacrificed and purchased it. We have invested time and money to have a new boiler and central heating, new electrics and plumbing. The property isn’t large but it will take us many years to complete the renovations whilst there is general maintenance work to pay-out for. We are not seeking to extend. We consider this to be our forever home and would be devastated if we were to be surrounded on all sides by dwellings and our outlook was to change. It would destroy our sanctuary.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4255  Respondent: 15479201 / Nick Norton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A47

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A47
I object to the proposal that the land that contains the majority of an SNCI should be proposed for housing development.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that "The purpose of planning is to help to achieve sustainable development" and it describes three "dimensions" relevant to this aim: economic, social and environmental. The explanation for how the environmental aspect plays a role includes the statement "…..helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently….." This is a quote from point 7 of the section dealing with achieving sustainable development, in the NPPF.

In the section headed “Conserving and enhancing the natural environment” (section 11), it is stated inter alia that planning policy should protect and enhance valued landscapes and minimize impacts on biodiversity providing net gains in biodiversity wherever possible to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, by promoting “the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority
habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations.....”. Guildford Borough Council (GBC) interprets the NPPF through their ‘Policy I4’ which emphasises the commitment to biodiversity stating: “The Council will conserve and enhance biodiversity and will seek opportunities for habitat restoration and creation, particularly within and adjacent to Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs)". Proposals for development must demonstrate how they will deliver appropriate net gains in biodiversity. Where proposals fall within or adjacent to a BOA, biodiversity measures should support that BOA’s objectives. The Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) will set out guidance on how this can be achieved. European sites designated as Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), National Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), local SNCIs and Local Nature Reserves are all shown on the Policies Map or as subsequently updated. Policy I4 goes on to say that "Permission will not be granted for proposals that are likely to materially harm the nature conservation interests of local sites unless clear justification is provided that the need for development clearly outweighs the impact on biodiversity.” The majority of the site covered by this part of the development is designated as an SNCI and lies within an area identified as a ‘Water Vole Alert Area’ as identified by the National Water Vole Database and Mapping Project in 2012. It is shocking that an SNCI should be considered a suitable site for development, particularly given the statements in the NPPF (Para 109) and Policy I4. I find it a telling insight into the very low value that GBC places on biodiversity and wildlife.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4748  **Respondent:** 15495521 / Jonathan Young  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A47

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT to the inclusion of Policy A47 and site A47 (Land to east of The Paddocks, Flexford) This land is clearly part of the open space around Flexford. It borders ancient woodland and agricultural land. It provides a natural soakaway for the existing housing and is under several inches of water for much of the year. A variety of wildlife including birds of prey and herons visit this site. Additionally the road infrastructure to access it is completely unsuitable (single narrow lane and bridge)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5300  **Respondent:** 15505025 / Ellen Knox  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A47

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I would like to register my objection to the inclusion of the land to east of the paddocks in the proposed submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016.
The inclusion of this piece of greenbelt land to the policy is in excess of the housing requirement in the area and there is by no means exceptional circumstances that require development on this land.

We bought our property in good faith that the protected green belt area in which we live would remain so. We live here because we want to bring our family up in a rural area; we access the house via an unadopted road and have no gas supply. Our neighbours including the owners of the local working farms work hard to protect and cherish the countryside we live in.

Flexford Road runs next to our property and is incapable of sustaining an increase of road users. The bridge floods every time it rains and Flexford road adjacent to the proposed site collects surface water after heavy downpours. The site itself can also flood at times of heavy rain. I have called the council numerous times to report the flooding on road and also the foul smell of sewage that can occur at times of flooding. It by no means feels a highway or drainage system capable of enduring a larger population.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7060  Respondent: 15619073 / Paul Collins  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A47

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Crownhall Estates (CE) has a long standing land promotion agreement in place with the owners of the 2 hectare parcel of land as edged blue on the plan.
2. The site is partly previously developed land2 and partly greenfield and that part of the site shown with green hatching is designated as a “Site of Nature Conservation Importance” (SNCI) primarily due to the site being noted as a “Water Vole Alert Area” due to the presence of the pond and stream on the site.
3. Sites of Nature Conservation Importance’ (SNCIs) are local designations which do not in themselves restrict development for the purposes of the Framework and in this case the site could be developed as allocated by setting aside and protecting the areas that are used by water voles (the ponds and the streams) so that any harm to this protected species would be avoided.
4. There are no other known constraints on development and the close proximity of the site to the railway station and the site for a proposed new school means that opportunities to maximize sustainable transport solutions for future residents of any housing and those already living in the area can be delivered by way of any development.
5. CE therefore considers and confirms that this is a deliverable housing site for up to 50 dwellings as envisaged in the allocation and should be identified as such in the allocation (currently the allocation suggests that the site is “developable” (years 6 – 10) rather than “deliverable”) years 1 -5) recognizing that any proposed development will need to address the site constraints identified.
6. Therefore CE looks forward to working with GBC so as to deliver this allocation.

<see attachments for related media>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  A9R19q51xi_o2grs0_1a8.jpg (137 KB)

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8145  Respondent: 15671297 / JB Planning Associates (Sue Foster)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A47
Our representations with respect to Policy A47 are set out in Section 4 of our submission.

**Representation on Policy A47: Land to the East of The Paddocks, Flexford**

**Introduction**

1. This representation is submitted on behalf of Countryside Properties in response to the Council’s decision to allocate Land to the East of the Paddocks as a Strategic Site Allocation (Policy A47) in the Regulation 19 Proposed Submission Local Plan.

1. This site, of approximately 2 ha, comprises three fields on gently sloping topography. The fields are enclosed treebelts to the north, hedgerows within open farmland to the east, residential gardens to the south, and treebelts to the west.

1. Below we briefly set out why we consider the proposed allocation is less sustainable than our Client’s site on land to the south of New Pond Road, Farncombe.

1. With regard to the landscape and visual impact of the proposed allocation and Green Belt considerations, we refer below to the key findings of the ‘Site Comparison Study’ prepared on behalf of our Client by Barton Willmore. The full findings of the Study are set out in Appendix 4.7.

1. In terms of sustainability we draw upon the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Guildford Proposed Submission Local Plan, which we have, where necessary, amended to address inaccuracies that we have noted with respect to our Client’s site. These results are set out in a table (see Appendix 4.8).

**Landscape and Visual Impact**

1. Barton Willmore has produced a Site Comparison Study, which provides a comparative assessment of our Client’s site against 4 other sites that have been identified as housing allocations within the Proposed Submission Local Plan. These were selected on the basis that they are also located outside of the settlement boundaries, within the Green Belt and are non-strategic. The sites are:

**Policy A38: Land to the West of West Horsley**

**Policy A41: Land to the South of West Horsley**

**Policy A44: Land to the West of Winds Ridge and Send Hill, Send**

**Policy A47: Land to the East of The Paddocks, Flexford**

1. Below we identify some of its key findings with respect to the impact of the development of Site A47 on landscape character:

   - Potential for substantial loss of vegetation;
   - Extension to the settlement pattern in an easterly direction; and
   - Adverse effect on public and private views

1. With respect to the contribution that Site A44 makes to the function of the Green Belt, Barton Willmore identified that:

   - The fact that development is already present on the site demonstrates that the site has a limited function when it comes to safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
• Development would result in the eastward sprawl of Flexford.

1. Barton Willmore’s study concludes that our Client’s site is comparative with the other sites in relation to landscape and visual considerations, in that it does not score significantly differently from the others to warrant its exclusion from the Proposed Submission Local Plan. In fact, our Client’s site scores considerably better in some respects to the other sites with regard to landscape and visual considerations, for example, our Client’s site is of lesser tranquillity due to the fact that it is adjoined by New Pond Road, and does not contain any footpaths, listed buildings or notable landscape features within the site

Sustainability

1. JBPA has produced a Site Comparison Table (Appendix 4.7) which looks at the same 4 sites identified in the Barton Willmore Assessment in terms of their overall sustainability as proposed housing allocations. It also compares these sites with our Client’s land at New Pond Road, Farncombe, and with land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford (Site A46) which has been brought forward as a new proposed housing allocation at the Proposed Submission Draft stage of the Local Plan. A separate representation on Site A46 is included with our submission in section 5.

1. When considering sustainability, we have drawn initially upon the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Guildford Proposed Submission Local Plan. We have, however, where necessary amended the scorings to address inaccuracies that we have noted in the SA with respect to our Client’s site. This includes correcting the distance to the nearest Primary School as the SA suggests this is less than 2km, when in fact it is less than 1km. We have also identified from available MAFF records that our Client’s land contains Grade 3 agricultural land, as opposed to Grade 1 land which is identified in the SA.

1. Below we set out our key conclusions when comparing Site A47 with our Client’s site:

1. Site A47 scored poorly (red) in relation to 8 sustainability criteria, whereas our Client’s site only scored poorly in 3 criteria
2. Site A47 is further from a key employment site, recreation facilities, a primary school, a secondary school and an “A” Road than our Client’s site.
3. Site A47 is closer to a European Site (SPA and SAC) and a Designation of Local Importance than our Client’s site. The majority of the site is designated as an SNCI
4. Our Client’s site scored worse than A44 with respect to flood risk, and its location within the AONB, however we have demonstrated in our site specific representation in relation to our Client’s site (Section 3) that it makes limited to no contribution to the special qualities and features of the Surrey Hills AONB, and that the area of the site within a flood zone has been agreed with the Environment Agency and will be left undeveloped

Conclusion

1. Informed by the findings of Barton Willmore’s “Site Comparison Study” and the Sustainability Appraisal of the Guildford Proposed Submission Local Plan, this representation sets out why we consider the proposed allocation at Land to the East of the Paddocks as a Strategic Site Allocation (Policy A47) is less sustainable and suitable than our Client’s site on land to the south of New Pond Road, Farncombe,

1. Barton Willmore’s study identifies that the site makes a contribution to two Green Belt purposes. Its development would result in the substantial loss of vegetation; an extension to the settlement pattern in an easterly direction; and an adverse effect on public and private views.

1. With respect to Sustainability we have determined that the site scored poorly (red) over significantly more sustainability criteria than our Client’s site. Also, the majority of the site is designated as an SNCI. Thus, our Client’s site represents a more sustainable location than a comparable site identified in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

Tests of Soundness
1. We consider that there is a risk of the Local Plan being found unsound with the proposed allocation of Site A47, instead of our Client’s site on land to the south of New Pond Road, because it will not be ‘justified’, as it does not represent the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives.

Proposed Modifications

1. In view of the above considerations, we believe that Land to the East of the Paddocks as a Strategic Site Allocation (Policy A47) should be removed from the Local Plan prior to submission for Examination.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  Policy A47.docx (53 KB)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8146  Respondent: 15671297 / JB Planning Associates (Sue Foster)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A47

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Please see our representations with respect to specific sections of the plan on the Question 6 Comments Form.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  Policy A47.pdf (592 KB)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7834  Respondent: 15674273 / Savills for Thames Water (Katherine Jones)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A47

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8066  Respondent: 15709153 / Heather Sohl  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A47

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A46 and A47 both fall within the Green Belt, but their inclusion here is not justified. The fundamental aim of green belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The NPPF states ‘the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence’ (NPPF). Past verdicts of planning inspectors have declared that Normandy/Flexford green fields (A46) contribute to the ‘openness’ of the Green Belt and a panoramic view of green fields to the Surrey Hills AONB.
Paragraph 4.3.1.2 of the Plan (under Policy P2) states that "only those villages whose open character makes an important contribution to the Green Belt should be included in the Green Belt". I contend that the land in both Policy A46 and A47 makes an unparalleled contribution to the Green Belt which stretches from Guildford in the east to Ash/Tongham in the west. If this area is inset and built upon in the manner proposed it will be the beginning of urban sprawl across this stretch of countryside which Green Belt policy was designed to prevent. The Government have indicated that Green Belt is supposed to be protected, but GBC are trying to justify development in this area when they themselves designated it as having a 'Red' status under their system for quantifying sensitivity (red being the most sensitive and least likely to be developed). GBC have totally ignored all policies on biodiversity when proposing to inset these areas.

New developments are supposed to maintain existing Green infrastructure and improve upon it; in order to secure sustainable development, there should be a net gain for biodiversity. It is impossible to agree that any Green infrastructure which would accompany this development could mitigate for the habitat loss and resultant decline of species.

According to the Council for Protection of Rural England (CPRE), 13% of the most important habitat areas identified in UK BAP occur in the Green Belt, and certain species such as the mistle thrush, song thrush and starling (known to use Site 46) are doing better in the Green Belt than in any other parts of England. Green Belt areas also show more positive trends of bird and butterfly species than in the urban fringes compared to them.

I object to the insetting of Normandy and Flexford (re: Policies A46 and A47) from the Green Belt on the grounds that these areas do contribute to 'openness of the Green Belt'.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pSLP172/2912  Respondent: 15709153 / Heather Sohl  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A47
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I support the removal of site A46 from the Local Plan. My previous submission to the Local Plan 2016 included reasons for my objection to the inclusion of this site, as there would be significant biodiversity loss if this development had proceeded, including to the Special Protection Area of the Thames Heaths Basin.

I support the removal of site A47 from the Local Plan. Again, I had objected previously to the inclusion of this site in Local Plan 2016, mainly on the grounds of biodiversity loss given that this is a designated Site of Nature Conservation Importance and therefore of high local wildlife value.

For both of these sites (A46 and A47) the reason for removal from the Local Plan was stated as being because no exceptional circumstances existed to remove this “high sensitivity” land from the Green Belt. This, again, provides greater evidence to the first point in this letter, from the Guildford Borough Council’s own documented rationale, that the insetting of the Green Belt at Flexford and Normandy is completely unjustified.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8075  Respondent: 15710369 / Steve Marshall  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A47
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**Impact of Policy A47**

The majority of the site covered by this part of the development is designated as an SNCI and lies within an area identified as a ‘Water Vole Alert Area’ as identified by the National Water Vole Database and Mapping Project in 2012.

It is shocking that GBC would ever consider an SNCI a suitable site for development, particularly given the statements in the NPPF (Para 109) and the Council's own Policy I4 as set out in section 2.1 and 2.2 above. We find it a telling insight into the very low value that GBC places on biodiversity and wildlife. I strongly object to policy A46 on these grounds.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1816  **Respondent:** 17288417 / Ian Dwyer  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A47

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Please note that I strongly support the removal of these sites owing to the inability to support the infrastructure. I further object to homes being placed outside the Green belt. It is there to protect out countryside and I object to further travellers being permitted to reside in the area.

Lastly, please ensure the cars for sale at the end of cobbett hill on the grass verge facing Henley park need to be removed. It is not a car showroom.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2663  **Respondent:** 17337249 / Ben Aaronson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A47

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( Yes ), is Sound? ( Yes ), is Legally Compliant? ( Yes )

I wholly agree with the decision to remove site A47.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2798  **Respondent:** 17365377 / M Swark  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A47

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I strongly support the removal of site A46 1,100 houses etc and site 47 no matter how [illegible word] there is too much traffic up and down Glaziers lane now these roads were not made for such amounts of traffic, also it will have a profound effect on road, sewage, wastewater, electricity supply and Doctors surgeries and I understand this is green belt not for building.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp172/2925  Respondent: 17373025 / Stephen Marshall  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A47

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object that the Policies Map – an important document – is of a scale that makes the detail impossible to distinguish. One of the sites I am most concerned about – the former A47 land – is completely covered by its label. Large swathes of green belt cover would also appear to be missing from the map.
- The NPPF states ‘the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence’ (NPPF). Past verdicts of planning inspectors have declared that Normandy/Flexford green fields (A46) contribute to the ‘openness’ of the Green Belt and a panoramic view of green fields to the Surrey Hills AONB – and indeed recent assessments are that this area along the south of the Hog’s Back is of sufficient quality to itself be included with the AONB due to its contribution to views. It is hugely important that this be considered before removing its protection and permanently losing the character of the area that make it outstanding in a national context.
- Paragraph 4.3.12 states that "only those villages whose open character makes an important contribution to the Green Belt should be included in the Green Belt". I contend that the land in both A46 and A47 makes an unparalleled contribution to the Green Belt which stretches from Guildford in the east to Ash/Tongham in the west. If this area is inset and built upon in the manner proposed it will be the beginning of urban sprawl across this stretch of countryside which Green Belt policy was designed to prevent. The Government have indicated that Green Belt is supposed to be protected, but GBC are trying to justify development in this area when they themselves designated it as having a 'Red' status under their system for quantifying sensitivity (red being the most sensitive and least likely to be developed).
- GBC have ignored the other existing value of A46 and A47 in removing the Green Belt protection. This land is high grade farmland and also includes several Sites of Nature Conservation Importance. All policies on biodiversity ave been ignored when proposing to inset these areas. The proposals are contrary to the NPPF’s requirements on biodiversity and the natural environment. In section 11 headed “Conserving and enhancing the natural environment”, it is stated that planning policy should protect and enhance valued landscapes and minimise impacts on biodiversity, providing net gains in biodiversity wherever possible to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, by promoting “the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations…..”. GBC is failing to do this in several ways in relation to A46 and A47 with no clear justification or evidence given as to why this is the case. It seems that no consideration has been given to the value of the existing SNCIs, the wider network of hedges and trees and the fact that all this is within one of Surrey’s Biodiversity Opportunity Areas – despite Policy I4 seeking to promote exactly these qualities. I object that Guildford has not given biodiversity the full consideration legally required, in breach not only of these policies but their statutory duty under the NERC Act 2006.
- I object to insetting and making permanent the traveller site at A49. A50 should not be inset. Normandy already has a disproportionate number of sites.

In summary, I object to the inset of Flexford settlement, Normandy settlement, Walden Cottages and the traveller sites A49 and A50, question whether there is any justification for the green belt boundaries around Normandy and Flexford to be changed from the existing and request that the insetting be removed from the new plan, particularly for former sites A46 and A47.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3129  Respondent: 17395073 / David Palmer  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A47

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In summary, I object to the inset of Flexford settlement, Normandy settlement, Walden Cottages and the traveller sites A49 and A50, question whether there is any justification for the green belt boundaries around Normandy and Flexford to be changed from the existing and request that the insetting be removed from the new plan, particularly for former sites A46 and A47.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. **Removal of sites A46 & A47**

I support the removal of these sites owing to the inability of the existing infrastructure (ie roads, wastewater, sewage, flooding, electricity supply and healthcare) to cope with developments of this magnitude and also that it is Green Belt land.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4012  **Respondent:** 17402625 / R Bhalla  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A47

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I thoroughly support the removal of site A46 and site A47. I believe this development is inappropriate: green belt area should mean green belt. Any encroachment will only have an adverse effect entailing such factors as flooding, sewage and particularly the extra traffic which the roads were never designed for.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3337  **Respondent:** 17407745 / Lilijana Howells  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A47

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a site providing 5 houses being excluded from the current draft Plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3734  **Respondent:** 17425569 / Jack Cross  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A47

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a site providing 5 houses being excluded from the current draft Plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

Total records: 72.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A58 - Land around Burnt Common warehouse, London Road, Send
### Comment ID: pslp172/1074  **Respondent:** 8559745 / Mr Brian East  **Agent:**
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because it was previously deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made at the time and there is no need to build an industrial site in the middle of Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

Such a development will further impact the surrounding roads and environment, creating traffic congestion, noise and pollution issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

### Comment ID: pslp172/3424  **Respondent:** 8562273 / The Clandon Society (Christopher Dean)  **Agent:**
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously. The Plan calls for a minimum of 7000sq. m (previously in the 2016 Plan a maximum figure) but will take 9.26 hectares out of the green belt. There is no proper justification given for taking the additional land.

1. The evidence base does not support this scale of additional industrial space and the justification for placing it in the green belt is not made out. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a demand for about 4 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Burnt Common in the green belt.
2. If the quality of some existing industrial provision is not adequate this should cause re-development of it not a large encroachment into the green belt.
3. The reference to waste management facilities mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and should not be so casually included for this site.

1. The A247 through West Clandon and Send is likely to experience large volumes of additional traffic including heavy vehicles generated by the proposed light industry, storage, distribution and waste management activities at Burnt Common. There is also the likelihood of commercial vehicle traffic between Slyfield and Burnt Common particularly when the Clay Lane access is built which will impact the same road.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

### Comment ID: pslp172/1576  **Respondent:** 8563713 / P-Fava.Consulting (Mr Peter Fava)  **Agent:**
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

**Attached documents:**
I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because the impact on the small surrounding roads will add to already overstretched roads in the area. There have been no appreciable improvements to the local infrastructure in the last forty years. Roads are gridlocked every time there is a problem at the M25 Junction 10. In one recent week that was on three days. This is damaging businesses locally.

Send Road is at maximum capacity every rush hour. The road through West Clandon cannot take two lorries passing each other without one having to mount the pavement. The narrowest part of The Street is close to a junior school. There is no chance of widening these roads without having to purchase local private property.

The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough, not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares in the Green Belt in Send.

It is quite clear that the whole basis of your plan for the Send area is politically motivated as neither of our councilors are Conservatives. This is totally unacceptable and has been noted by the electorate locally.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3592</th>
<th>Respondent: 8566049 / Mr David W Lazenby</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A 58, for development at Burnt Common which was deleted from the 2014 draft plan, but is now re-inserted with no justification. There is capacity at the existing Slyfield site. The road traffic effects at Burnt Common would be immense, and the existing conditions are already overloaded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4162</th>
<th>Respondent: 8570273 / Fiona Curtis</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The stated, albeit unproven need, is 7,000 sq m B1c, B2 and B8 development. Normal density 50% plot ratio. Land required 1.4 ha. Land allocated 9.26 ha. This is more than six and half times more land than necessary in valuable Green Belt which the planners should be looking after.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnt Common Policy A 53 Object</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The plan fails to produce a coherent development strategy for Guildford Town. GBC has deleted its independently commissioned Town Centre Master Plan by the well renowned firm of architects and master planners Allies and Morrison as a source document from the plan even though this master plan was previously well publicised and enthusiastically adopted by the Council.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3189  Respondent: 8571137 / G Mansbridge  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to POLICY A58, BURNT COMMON: because there is no need for excessive amounts of industrial and warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt - see the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1573  Respondent: 8574369 / Douglas French  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because it was deleted from the 2014 draft because of the many objections made previously and there is no proven need for so much industrial development locally. This is Green Belt land and should not be used for industrial development with no proven need when there is plenty of land available at the Slyfield site. Why would anyone build industrial units in the middle of a village when other sites are available? Again this development would join up the existing villages and clog up the local roads with heavy traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3771  Respondent: 8574369 / Douglas French  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A58

Now a new allocation for a minimum of 7000 sq metres of industrial or warehousing
6.1 The 2016 draft plan referred to a “maximum” of 7000 sq metres. This has been quietly changed to “minimum” in a period when the demand trend for industrial land has declined. This is serious over-provision.

6.2 It makes no sense to put industrial and/or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield Industrial Estate in Guildford still has plenty of unused capacity.

6.3 The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.423a lacks enough detail for proper consultation but would appear to be completely inappropriate.

6.4 There can be no sensible basis for allocating almost 10 hectares of industrial and warehouse facilities in a small village like Send when the latest ELNA 2017 shows only 3.9 hectares are required for the whole borough. This can only be interpreted as a serious over concentration in one unsuitable place for which there has been no declared explanation.

Objections relating to both Garlick’s Arch A43 and Burnt Common A58

7.1 I object to both of these proposals separately but also to their combined effect.

7.2 They will join up Ripley and Send destroying the purpose of the Green Belt.

7.3 They will increase the totality of residential and commercial traffic on the small roads in our villages very substantially. It needs to be appreciated that the main road A247 is absolutely at capacity already and these developments added to those proposed at all the other sites in neighbouring villages will hugely impact on the traffic on Send Road, and also on side roads as people make attempts to avoid traffic gridlock on their way, for example, to Woking Station. A very much more detailed analysis is needed of the traffic impact because the A247 at Send is the one place where nearly all of it will converge.

7.4 Roads are but one of the infrastructure implications which the combined impact of all these developments will have. Others are covered in my 2016 objection.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1855  Respondent: 8579233 / Mrs Purrett  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A58**

**Objections**

Why has the “up to” 7000 sq m of employment floorspace, which appears to have moved from Garlick’s Arch, been changed to “minimum of 7000 sq m with a potential for further industrial floorspace to meet borough needs”? I understand the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for Industrial land for the whole borough, not a huge over allocation of over 9 hectares potential development at Send in the Green Belt. The impact of substantial development on the surrounding roads, environment and life of the Residents would be serious and would virtually join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1778  Respondent: 8581729 / Jeffrey Gargan  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. NEW POLICY A58 - Land around Burnt Common warehouse, London Road, Send P"&A58. I objected to the original proposal to enclose large areas of Green Belt open space within inset boundaries around the villages of Send and Send Marsh/Burnt Common where there will be a presumption in favour of development. The new policy A58 increases the area of land to the extracted to a minimum of 7,000 square metres of "employment floorspace". I therefore object to this proposal as there is no proven need to allocate any Green Belt land within the Borough for industrial/warehouse development. This is particular location would have a severely adverse environmental effect not just on the two villages but all the surrounding area creating major traffic problems and overdevelopment of the local rural communities.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1855  Respondent: 8579233 / Mrs Purrett  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A58.

*Now a new allocation for a minimum of 7,000 sq m of industrial or warehousing*

I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:

1. **It was deleted from the 2014 draft** because of all the objections made previously
2. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land.

3. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

4. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

5. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

6. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---------------

Comment ID: pslp172/2898  Respondent:  8586017 / Leslie Brown  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY A58

I object to this proposal which is not defined and therefore open to interpretation. Any development of that type and on that scale will again impact the road infrastructure on the edge of two villages, Send and Ripley. In any case the need for them is unclear especially when there seems to be spare capacity at Slyfield industrial estate which is much more appropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---------------

Comment ID: pslp172/4717  Respondent:  8586369 / Mr Luigi Fort  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site.
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented."
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: pslp172/4129 | Respondent: 8587105 / Linda Parker-Picken | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |

I object to the allocation of 8 travelling showpeople pitches at the Garlick’s Arch site. Local Plan H1 Policy states that such accommodation should be provided to development sites of 500 homes and above. The Garlick’s Arch site is for a proposed 400 houses (and the whole development is highly contentious) Two traveller pitches were already allocated to Policy A44, a development of 40 houses only and there is no justification for further traveller accommodation in this area. The 8 pitches for travelling showpeople should be allocated to a development of 500 or more houses in the Guildford Borough to meet Policy H1.

I support the decision to move employment floorspace from Garlick’s Arch to Burnt Common (A58) as the latter site is already industrial. I consider it would also be a more appropriate location for travellers, with easy access to the A3.

However, I object to the change from “up to 7000 sq m” to “a minimum of 7000 sq m” now allocated to A58. That leaves this site open to unlimited future development. The local road network is not suitable for unlimited increase and will probably struggle even with 7000 sq m max additional employment floorspace. Document T47 refers to “Significant, recurrent traffic congestion … experienced during peak hours on the A3 trunk road as it runs through the town of Guildford and between the Ripley junction and the A3/M25 (Junction 10) Wisley interchange junction” (transport) ie the next junction from Burnt Common travelling north on the A3.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I Object to POLICY A58 at BURNT COMMON because:

It was deleted in the 2014 plan because of so many objections were made.

There is no need to build industrial or warehousing development IN THE MIDDLE OF THE PRECIOUS GREEN BELT when Slyfield and Guildford have EMPTY sites and industrial units.

The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a REDUCTION in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial use in the whole Borough NOT a huge allocation of 10 hectares at SEND IN THE GREEN BELT.

The resultant GRIDLOCK in the already very congested local roads from car and heavy transport would be a disaster for local Send residents.

AGAIN this will join up local villages thus defeating the object of our precious Green Belt.

The WORD MINIMUM has been craftily changed from the previous MAXIMUM in the 2016 plan and since then there has been a large decline in demand for industrial land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I OBJECT to the proposed changes to POLICY A58 at Burntcommon, where the plan now is to allocate 10 hectares for industrial/warehousing on what is currently Green Belt land. This is totally unnecessary as the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the WHOLE of Guildford Borough, and there is still spare capacity at Slyfield.

This would also cause a huge impact on all our local roads, particularly at the Burntcommon roundabout, A247/B2215. One of my main worries is that, together with all the extra traffic generated by the 400 houses at Garlick's Arch and the 60 at Clockharn Nursery site, it will become almost impossible to exit our Avenue (a 2/3rds of a mile long cul-de-sac containing 76 properties) at peak times, as our entrance is only about 100 yards from the roundabout. This will cause great and unacceptable difficulties for emergency vehicles as well.

The above situation will be made much worse, in fact, if the proposed new slip roads to the A3 (to and from Clandon Road, to give access to and from London bound traffic) are built, as traffic using these new slip roads will also mainly be using our roundabout. I can foresee gridlock for most of the day, every day!!

Regarding this whole new Local Development Plan, far too little thought has gone into the road infrastructure planning.
Enormous improvements to the A3 around Guildford, as well as the local major roads, simply MUST TAKE PLACE BEFORE the huge house and industrial building projects are constructed, NOT AFTERWARDS!!

Our present road system is overloaded right now --- please listen to those of us who have to live with the current situation every day, and do not put the cart before the horse ... take the blinkers off, I implore you! Before retiring. I helped run a large housebuilding business. When we constructed a new estate, the first thing we did was to build the roads ... and then the houses --- not the other way round!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3003  Respondent: 8595905 / Mrs Jane Whatley  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the change of wording for the industrial site at Burnt Common (Policy A58) as it would permit far more industrial space to be built even than was originally allocated. This removes all upper limits for the size of the proposed and any future development on this site. I am sure that all of us can point to any number of empty industrial buildings in the area at both Slyfield and in Guildford itself, so on what premise are Guildford basing the need for such enormous amounts of industrial space, and more specifically in the Green Belt, to be turned over to industrial use? I understand that the need for such space has actually reduced according to a recent Land Assessment so this is entirely unfounded, and indeed was removed from previous planning drafts due to weight of opinion, so what has changed? The three distinct settlements of Send, Send Marsh and Ripley will simply merge and lose their identities and for what? For industrial buildings on our beautiful Green Belt, traffic gridlock and more polluted air for us all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2992  Respondent: 8598561 / Sarah Belton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A58 - on the grounds that again it is part of the green-belt and hence development is not permitted, and further, that such development is inappropriate when other industrial sites in the Borough have empty space (e.g. Slyfield Industrial Estate) and there is no proven need for further industrial space. I object to the wording minimum' replacing maximum' of 7000 sq m, deliberately opening up any approved development to unlimited expansion. This is an appalling abuse of the planning process.

I would add weight to my overall objection to the proposals, identifying that the A247 Send Road is a narrow and residential road, in spite of the fact that it links the A3 and M25 to Woking town centre and its mainline station to London, and coach service to Heathrow Airport. It is congested in peak times, carrying heavy vehicle and commuter traffic through bottle necks of parked cars and the narrow bridge at Broadmeads. This bridge is not wide enough to allow two heavy vehicles to pass over it at the same time. The road is also heavily used by cyclists commuting into Woking, creating further congestion and hazards. It is madness to add to this traffic from hundreds of local houses and industrial sites, plus traffic from other huge proposed developments such as the massive number of houses proposed at Wisley.
Airport and nearby Ockham, Clondon and Horsley wards, (policies A35, A37, A38, A39 and A40 - at least 2500 homes) is madness.

Currently on a daily basis, the A3 from Burpham to the M25 is almost at a stand-stili in both the morning and evening peak times due to the sheer weight of traffic. When there is a major hold up on the M25 or A3, the traffic can back up as far as the A247 at Broadmeads. Adding more commuter and industrial traffic will only exacerbate this, while changing the junction at Burnt Common is unlikely to improve the situation, and may actually add to the problem.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2392</th>
<th>Respondent: 8598785 / Mr Roger Parslow</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because

The word ‘minimum’ is a change from the previous ‘maximum’ in the 2016 plan. Minimum is open-ended and a cause of considerable concern with regard to traffic

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2399</th>
<th>Respondent: 8598785 / Mr Roger Parslow</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

- The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2283</th>
<th>Respondent: 8600929 / Roger Newland</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Policy A58 – I object to the proposal to create a large employment area in the Green Belt at Burnt Common which is inappropriate with no identified demand. Setting a minimum square meterage is disingenuous and will lead to developer led spread. Redevelopment of existing brown field industrial sites could be supported especially if it is for small commercial units.

Overall the Council's proposals are deplorable and therefore I object to the plan being submitted to the Inspectorate.

I have not re-addressed the points made previously but they remain relevant making the current iteration Local Plan a travesty which I object to in the strongest terms.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/849  Respondent: 8604481 / Mr Steve Minter  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because

(a) It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously

(b) There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units

(c) The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge overallocation of 10 hectares at one location, Send, in the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/537  Respondent: 8606081 / Susan Greenman  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A58

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common. This plan was deleted from the 2014 draft due to the volume of objections.

The word "minimum" has been changed from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan. Since then there has been a decline in demand for industrial land.

There is no need to build industrial or warehousing on Green Belt. This should be built on Brown Belt not in a rural setting. Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole of the Borough not a vast over allocation of 10 hectares at Send on Green Belt.
Once again the increase of traffic from this Policy Plan will cause major traffic congestion in an area which is already suffering.

The pollution will just add to the already existing problem of air quality in the area from the A3, M25 and Heathrow and Gatwick Airports.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2334  Respondent: 8609217 / West Clandon Parish Council (John Stone)  Agent:  

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1) This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

2) The Plan calls for a minimum of 7000sq. m (previously in the 2016 Plan a maximum figure) but will take 9.26 hectares out of the green belt. There is no proper justification given for taking the additional land.

3) The evidence base does not support this scale of additional industrial space and the justification for placing it in the green belt is not made out. If the quality of some existing industrial provision is not adequate this should cause re-development of it not a large encroachment into the green belt. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a demand of 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Burnt Common in the green belt.

4) The reference to waste management facilities mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and should not be so casually included for this site.

5) The proposal for light industry, storage, distribution and waste management activities at Burnt Common will generate large amounts of traffic including heavy vehicles on the A247.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4706  Respondent: 8655233 / Kay Mackay  Agent:  

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Burnt Common strategic industrial employment site for light industry, storage and distribution activities. It is to be designated an Industrial Strategic Employment Site which means that it is a preferred site for industrial development including waste management facilities. The site is 9ha which it is stated allows for considerable future expansion. This will generate large amounts of traffic including heavy vehicles on the A247.

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site.

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented."

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Ref: A58 - The planned Industrial development will again overload the A247 through Clandon and roads around Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2586  Respondent: 8729313 / Lisa Wright  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object as this is a brand new addition to the Local Plan and has not be subject to the same scrutiny as other sites in the Plan.

I object on the following basis;

It's Greenbelt and no special circumstances have been given to change this land classification.

Traffic along this stretch of Send is dangerously fast, there will be a multitude of accidents if you increase the traffic in this area.

You only need 2-3 acres of land to build 7000sq m of property, Why have you allocated 10 times that amount for this site? Would it not have been more 'open' to say that you intend to build 500,000 sq m of industrial units on this site rather than lie?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1033  Respondent: 8731649 / Ian Slater  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch)

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

1. a)The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, ... (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]”
2. b)The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/829  Respondent: 8734785 / Bill Houghton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the policy A58 at Burnt Common because

a. The new proposal refers to a 'minimum' development whereas the original proposal asked for a 'maximum' allocation. In other words no set limit. Any requirement for industrial or warehousing should be part of the Slyfield site & should in no way encroach on our Green Belt.

b. The 2017 Land Need Assessment made it clear that a reduction in demand for such development was envisaged

c. This would have a disastrous affect on local traffic flow, the short section of the A247 between Burnt Common roundabout & the bridge over the A3 already creates real & dangerous problems at busy times of the day when trying to join the almost continuous flow of traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4736  Respondent: 8741761 / June Yorath  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that "there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented."

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for
an additional 33,607 sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750 sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357 sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357 sq m.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2470  Respondent: 8746753 / Miles Hackett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 for a minimum of 7,000 sq m of employment floorspace at Burnt Common, London Road. Originally this site was proposed for development in 2014, this was then replaced in 2016 by Garlick’s Arch on the other side of the road so it could include a new road junction onto the A3. Now it is proposed that both sites are used. This is clearly overdevelopment in one area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3067  Respondent: 8746753 / Miles Hackett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 for a minimum of 7,000 sq m of employment floorspace at Burnt Common, London Road. Originally this site was proposed for development in 2014, this was then replaced in 2016 by Garlick's Arch on the other side of the road so it could include a new road junction onto the A3. Now it is proposed that both sites are used. This is clearly overdevelopment in one area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
1. I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357 sq m in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607 sq m of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750 sq m of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357 sq m in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357 sq m.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**Comment ID:** pslp172/1983  **Respondent:** 8771233 / Ranald Mackinnon  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Burnt Common strategic industrial employment site for light industry, storage and distribution activities. It is to be designated an Industrial Strategic Employment Site which means that it is a preferred site for industrial development including waste management facilities. The site is 9ha which it is stated allows for considerable future expansion. This will generate large amounts of traffic including heavy vehicles on the A247.

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site.

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:

It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously

- The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
- It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

(3) I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:

This proposal was previously deleted from the 2014 draft as a result of the objections. I’m unclear as to why these have now been ignored. I object to these changes in the latest draft local plan on the basis that:

1. This is an area with prolific birds and wildlife
2. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when only a few miles away Slyfield and Guildford are under utilised (they still have empty sites and industrial units)
3. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough. The proposal is out of kilter with this demand.
4. The impact on small surrounding roads will create more traffic problems in an area already struggling
5. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potentially newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2213</th>
<th>Respondent: 8796321 / Nick Etches</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to site A58 Burnt Common, which has now become a ‘Strategic Employment Site’. The overall burden on Send (and West Clandon) of the minimum of 7000sq m of industrial space (i.e. could be much larger) is greater than the now deleted up-to 7000 sq m from the neighbouring site A43 Garlick’s Arch. This is a net gain in traffic and congestion in this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
area. The proposed inseting of Send Business Park from the Green Belt indicates GBC’s increased emphasis and ambition for growth of this village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2428  Respondent: 8796481 / Sally Erhardt  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal for a waste management facility in Green Belt at site A58. Transparency is greatly lacking in the plan regarding this waste management facility. It is very unclear in policy 4.423a and this does not allow for proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4390  Respondent: 8796673 / Suzanne Burroughs  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately
half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1962  Respondent: 8798849 / David Williams  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Burnt Common strategic industrial employment site for light industry, storage and distribution activities. It is to be designated an Industrial Strategic Employment Site which means that it is a preferred site for industrial development including waste management facilities. The site is 9ha which it is stated allows for considerable future expansion. This will generate large amounts of traffic including heavy vehicles on the A247.

- I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
- This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
- The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
- There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
- The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for
an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

• 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

• The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

• The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

• It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

• The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

• The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

• The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/368  Respondent: 8800705 / Michael Cumper  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A58 Burnt Common, London Road

It was removed from the 2014 draft due to these objections. There is no need to build more industrial and warehouse units when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units. Doing this on Green Belt when it is unnecessary must not happen. The evidence shows that that the demand for this is just not there.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4501  Respondent: 8801505 / Paul Edwards  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2146  Respondent: 8803617 / Timothy Bruton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site A58- Land around Burnt Common warehouse.

This site had previously been found unsuitable for development in earlier versions of the plan. Development will be continuous with the Gosden Farm site on the other side of the A3 giving a ribbon development of Guildford along the A3. This together with Garlick’s Arch development therefore gives a continuous urban development from Ockham Road North to Onslow Village and this is approximately 7.5 miles of urbanisation. This is a significant degradation of the Guildford environment in contradiction to the stated development criteria in the Local Plan.

Insetting the Send Business Centre within the green belt.
Policy A 58. 9.26 hectares at Burnt Common, for an initial minimum of 7,000m2 of industrial space. This is by far the biggest potential problem with the latest round of changes. GBC have changed two little letters here - ‘maximum’ becomes ‘minimum’ and the possibility is thus opened up of a huge new development on Green Belt land, in a location where there is actually, according to recent research, reduced demand for industrial space. Such industrial development will cause very heavy additional traffic on the surrounding roads, where there are already long queues in the rush hour. I’m genuinely baffled by what passes through the heads of GBC on this issue: they must have cars, they must sometimes sit for long periods as we do in jams going up the hill past the university on the A3 or indeed on the A3 northbound past the Potter’s Lane and Ripley turn-offs; or find their routes to school or work are solid due to the smallest roadworks; and yet they’re quite happy to say they’re addressing the problem of accommodation for people working in schools and hospitals in Guildford not by providing houses in the immediate vicinity of the town but by building a mini-commuter belt in Wisley, Horsley, Send etc.. from which people will need to climb into their cars by the thousand and head off into the complete gridlock the Plan will have created. Except of course that most of the new housing won’t be affordable, as above, so most of the cars may be heading the other way, into London.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
1. I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site.

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word "minimum" is a change from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that "there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented."

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states "that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space."

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a "constraint" on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C.iii. Policy A58 Burnt Common – My Objections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607 sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4622  Respondent: 8817153 / Paul Ives  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This appears to be a suitable site for light industrial use, provided that the pastoral nature of the area is maintained by sensitive planning, including landscaping and tree planting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3900  Respondent: 8817537 / Kim Meredith  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A58, land at Burnt Common, London Road for the following reasons:

1. This was deleted from the 2014 draft plan because of all the objections previously made – therefore why has it been included again?
2. There has been a decline in demand for industrial land since the previous draft plan but the 2016 version uses the word ‘maximum’ a change from ‘minimum’ within it – this does not make sense.
3. There are already empty sites and units at Slyfield and Guildford and therefore no need to build new industrial and warehouse developments in our area. I can only envisage these will end up being empty too.
4. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand for industrial land for the whole borough to 3.9 hectares. This policy is a huge allocation of 10 hectares for Send alone. Totally unacceptable.
5. The small roads around this area are already often at gridlock. This can only make the problem worse.
6. The merging of existing villages (which will occur) defeats the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3904  Respondent: 8817537 / Kim Meredith  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned in policy 4.423a and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.
1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Sell in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
New policy A58 - Land around Burnt Common warehouse, London Road, Send P2 and A58).
I have previously objected to the proposed enclosure of huge areas of Green Belt open space within 'inset boundaries' around the villages of Send and Send Marsh/Burnt Common where there will be a presumption in favour of development. The new policy A58 seeks to increase the area of land to be extracted from the Green Belt for a minimum of 7,000 sq.m of 'employment floorspace. I therefore object to this proposal on the grounds that there is no proven need to allocate any Green Belt land within the Borough for industrial/warehouse development and the fact that, at this particular location, it would have a very severe and adverse environmental impact not only on the two villages, but throughout the whole surrounding area. overdeveloping the local rural communities and creating major traffic problems.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attard documents:

---

1. I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4682  Respondent: 8827777 / Mary English  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site.

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the
poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potentially newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3933  Respondent: 8828385 / Thomas Meredith  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A58, land at Burnt Common, London Road for the following reasons:

1. This was deleted from the 2014 draft plan because of all the objections previously made – therefore why has it been included again?
2. There has been a decline in demand for industrial land since the previous draft plant but the 2016 version uses the word ‘maximum’ a change from ‘minimum’ within it – this does not make sense.
3. There are already empty sites and units at Slyfield and Guildford and therefore no need to build new industrial and warehouse developments in our area. I can only envisage these will end up being empty too.
4. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand for industrial land for the whole borough to 3.9 hectares. This policy is a huge allocation of 10 hectares for Send alone. Totally unacceptable.
5. The small roads around this area are already often at gridlock. This can only make the problem worse.
6. The merging of existing villages (which will occur) defeats the purpose of the Green Belt.

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned in policy 4.423a and does not allow for full and proper consultation. This is unacceptable

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2247  Respondent: 8828929 / Janice Hurdle  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common which is a new addition to the previous plan despite being removed from the 2014 plan due to the large number of objections. It wants to add a minimum of 7,000 sq m with a potential for further industrial floorspace to be developed in the future. This would create an unacceptable volume of traffic on roads which are not suitable for large lorries. Traffic is already gridlocked through Send during the rush hour. In addition there is now
evidence stating there has been a reduction in demand for industrial land in the borough NOT a huge increase! Building here would defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3873  
Respondent: 8839521 / Lynn Yeo  
Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

4) I OBJECT to Policy A 58 change at Burnt Common

This site was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously and there has not been any change in circumstances which would support the reintroduction and expansion of the site.

The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of almost 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt. Given the decline in demand for industrial land in Guildford, there is no need to build industrial or warehouse developments on Green Belt land when there are currently empty sites and industrial units in Slyfield and around Guildford.

The development of a large scale industrial site in this area would create high levels of noise and air pollution from the vehicles using the site, and create traffic congestion on the small surrounding roads. This would be to the detriment of neighbouring residents and many pedestrians who use the nearby stretch of A247 where Send's infant and primary school, as well as medical centre are located.

The word "minimum" is a change from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. Policy A58 does not provide an appropriate limit to the scale of industrial development to take place on this site. The previous allocation for employment land at Garlick’s Arch stated that up to 7,000sqm of employment floorspace would be created. No such maximum amount exists within Policy A58, with at least 7,000sqm of employment land proposed on Land around Burnt Common Warehouse. Where previously there was a maximum of 7,000sqm proposed, it is now a minimum of 7,000sqm, opening the site to unbounded levels of development. This is unacceptable as it opens the door to a significant intensification of this site with no limits on this 90,000sqm site. I object to the potential unlimited development on this Green Belt site.

It will join up existing villages of Send, Ripley and West Clandon and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt. There are no 'exceptional circumstances' to justify the development of this land for industrial use and the evidence actually shows a decrease in the amount of industrial land required in the whole borough to 3.9 hectares, not the almost 10 hectares proposed just for this one site. There are no sensible reasons to support the development of this site. There are however many factors that make it a very poor and unsuitable site for the level of development proposed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3500  
Respondent: 8839553 / David Burnett  
Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
This site was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously and there has not been any change in circumstances which would support the reintroduction and expansion of the site.

The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of almost 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt. Given the decline in demand for industrial land in Guildford, there is no need to build industrial or warehouse developments on Green Belt land when there are currently empty sites and industrial units in Slyfield, Sheerwater, and other areas around Guildford.

The development of a large scale industrial site in this area would create high levels of noise and air pollution from the vehicles using the site, and create traffic congestion and wear on the small surrounding roads. This would be to the detriment of neighbouring residents and many pedestrians who use the nearby stretch of A247 where Send's infant and primary school, as well as medical centre are located.

There is also no consideration of the increased surface water runoff which may block the existing exit from the A3 onto the London Road B2215.

The word "minimum" is a change from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. Policy A58 does not provide an appropriate limit to the scale of industrial development to take place on this site. The previous allocation for employment land at Garlick’s Arch stated that up to 7,000sqm of employment floorspace would be created. No such maximum amount exists within Policy A58, with at least 7,000sqm of employment land proposed on Land around Burnt Common Warehouse. Where previously there was a maximum of 7,000sqm proposed, it is now a minimum of 7,000sqm, opening the site to unbounded levels of development. This is unacceptable as it opens the door to a significant intensification of this site with no limits on this 90,000sqm site. I object to the potential unlimited development on this Green Belt site.

It will join up existing villages of Send, Ripley and West Clandon and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt. There are no 'exceptional circumstances' to justify the development of this land for industrial use and the evidence actually shows a decrease in the amount of industrial land required in the whole borough to 3.9 hectares, not the almost 10 hectares proposed just for this one site. There are no sensible reasons to support the development of this site. There are however many factors that make it a very poor and unsuitable site for the level of development proposed.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2244  **Respondent:** 8839745 / Ripley Parish Council (Suzie Powell-Cullingford)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to Site A58 as a Strategic Industrial Employment Site. I did not have any objection to an earlier Local Plan provision to utilise this site as part housing and part light-industrial use, given that it is a small brownfield site. However I strongly object to this updated 2017 Site A58 proposal as there is a potential for the inclusion of Waste Management Facilities, which is entirely inappropriate in this location. In addition, I object to the open-ended proposal that the 7000sq metre site has potential to meet future industrial floorspace needs, as this gives no clear indication of the ultimate size of this site, nor its uses.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2018  **Respondent:** 8840033 / Jimmy Daboo  **Agent:**
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Burnt Common strategic industrial employment site for light industry, storage and distribution activities. It is to be designated an Industrial Strategic Employment Site which means that it is a preferred site for industrial development including waste management facilities. The site is 9ha which it is stated allows for considerable future expansion. This will generate large amounts of traffic including heavy vehicles on the A247.

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site.
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented”.
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units. This is particularly wasteful at a time when our economy is under stress and every effort should be made to be efficient.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space”.
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up poor existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the changes being proposed in and around Burnt Common as this will increase the traffic congestion and increase the strain on the local road network which is already at a severe level.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

B.iv. Policy A58 – My Objections

8) Burnt Common strategic industrial employment site for light industry, storage and distribution activities. It is to be designated an Industrial Strategic Employment Site which means that it is a preferred site for industrial development including waste management facilities. The site is 9ha which it is stated allows for considerable future expansion. This will generate large amounts of traffic including heavy vehicles on the A247.

C.iii. Policy A58 Burnt Common – My Objections

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately
half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

15. I object to the potential impact of para 4.4.23a on Burnt Common with its over allocation of industrial zoning is subterfuge for a waste management facility which is a dishonest and underhand approach to planning and proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2488  Respondent:  8845985 / John Aldridge  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Burnt Common, London Road - Policy A58 I object to the proposal for a minimum of 7000 sq m of industrial warehousing for the following reasons:-

- There is no requirement to build on this site when Slyfield and Guildford have empty sites
- The recent Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand for industrial land; therefore there is no need to allocate sites in the countryside

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2491  Respondent: 8854785 / Desmond McCann  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

- *The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm,… (site allocation A25) [than the Burnt Common site did]*
The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting. And at the same time Surrey County Council are cutting back on existing Community Recycling Centre. A little more joined up thinking here would help.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3027  Respondent: 8854785 / Desmond McCann  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch) GBCs own reasons for including Garlick's Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

- The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm,.. (site allocation A25) [than the Burnt Common site did]"
- The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs” Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives. Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick's Arch to be included.

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting. And at the same time Surrey County Council are cutting back on existing Community Recycling Centre. A little more joined up thinking here would help.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4382  Respondent: 8855649 / John Coleman  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
25.2 This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

25.3 The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

25.4 There is in fact no justification for building anymore industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented “.

25.5 There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

25.6 The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

25.7 The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

25.8 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

25.9 The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

25.10 The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

25.11 It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

25.12 The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

25.13 The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

25.14 The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

25.15 I object to the potential impact of para 4.4.23a on Burnt Common with its over allocation of industrial zoning is subterfuge for a waste management facility which is a dishonest and underhand approach to planning and proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3138</th>
<th>Respondent: 8859585 / Claire Yates</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously.
- The word ‘minimum’ is a change from the previous ‘maximum’ in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land.
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
- It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4463</th>
<th>Respondent: 8865537 / P Waldner</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately.
half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4347  Respondent: 8865665 / David Williams  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3. Policy A48 Land at Burnt Common, London Road

I question the employment needs justification that appears to omit the new jobs created by the major Vision Engineering factory in Send Road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4592  Respondent: 8865985 / Grant Ringshaw  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing
pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline
developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been
consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and
Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land
for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment
floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for
an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of
4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space
than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to
develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately
half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial
space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced
by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the
poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot
apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs
Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use
classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand
dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for
proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.
15. I object to the potential impact of para 4.4.23a on Burnt Common with its over allocation of industrial zoning is
subterfuge for a waste management facility which is a dishonest and underhand approach to planning and proper
consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2082  Respondent: 8875233 / Richard Hiam  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

Burnt Common strategic industrial employment site for light industry, storage and distribution activities. It is to be
designated an Industrial Strategic Employment Site which means that it is a preferred site for industrial development
including waste management facilities. The site is 9ha which it is stated allows for considerable future expansion. This
will generate large amounts of traffic including heavy vehicles on the A247.

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial
Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the
objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has
been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to
build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4603  Respondent: 8875329 / Katherine Cornwall  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ) ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

15. I object to the potential impact of para 4.4.23a on Burnt Common with its over allocation of industrial zoning is subterfuge for a waste management facility which is a dishonest and underhand approach to planning and proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2329  Respondent: 8875361 / P A Clarke  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to policy A58, Land at Burnt Common, London Road. The change of the size of the area has been changed from a MAXIMUM of 7,000 sq m to a MINIMUM of 7,000 sq m when the demand for industrial land is falling. There is no need to build industrial units here when there are still empty brownfield industrial sites in the borough. The word MINIMUM implies there is no ceiling on amount of land that will be developed. The impact of additional car and HGV traffic generated by this scheme will place an additional burden on the already overcrowded local roads: the Burnt
Common Roundabout at the junction of the B2215 and A247 being difficult enough to navigate now in the rush hour without any additional traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/4676</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8875969 / Sean Gilchrist</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1453  Respondent: 8876257 / Peter S Cliff  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site A58 Burnt Common:-

This is designated as a strategic employment site with potential for further industrial floorspace to meet future borough needs. This phrase is too open ended. To assess the stresses which industry would place on the local infrastructure more detail about potential size of operation, size of workforce (i.e. traffic-car/lorry journeys) is needed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2174  Respondent: 8879937 / Dietlinde Brown  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58). The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2223  Respondent: 8880385 / John Telfer  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to changes to land at Burnt Common Policy A58 because in 2016 the plan stated a maximum area of 7000m2 of industrial building and changed to a minimum of 7000m2 i.e eventually the whole area of 9 hectares of land could be covered by industrial buildings I don’t think that is the real intention of the council planners. Again there is no demonstrable need or demand for such industrial building because there are empty plots at Slyfield Green

Furthermore the 2017 Employment Lane Need Assessment anticipates a seduction to 3.9 hectares for the whole borough. Again the access will be from the old A3 causing yet more vehicular congestion with additional heavy lorries and plant.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/955  Respondent: 8883841 / Pamela French  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- The potential for a substantial increase in industrial floorspace from 7000 sq m to an unspecified amount at the site A58 Burnt Common does not provide local residents with sufficient information for a full and proper consultation given the ambiguity and lack of detail within the document.
- The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, in policy 4.432a and does not allow for full and proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2876  Respondent: 8886945 / Brian Osborn  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to A58 Land at Burnt Common. The allocation for a minimum of 7,000 square meters of industrial warehousing is major expansion and overdevelopment. The road infrastructure cannot cope and it will make the A3 and A247 impossible for traffic and increase pollution.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4631  Respondent: 8892737 / David Eagle  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

C.iii. Policy A58 Burnt Common – My Objections

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that "there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented."

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

15. I object to the potential impact of para 4.4.23a on Burnt Common with its over allocation of industrial zoning is subterfuge for a waste management facility which is a dishonest and underhand approach to planning and proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4411  Respondent: 8896993 / Caroline Gray  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to Policy A58 land at Burnt Common, London road. This is now a new allocation which was previously dropped from the 2014 draft Plan which was again objected to by the local residents and scrapped. All the previous objections still stand. This Policy has now been reintroduced with the wording from the previous Plan " to a minimum of 7,000 sq.ft. From a maximum of 7,000sq.ft".

There is no need to build an industrial and warehousing development in the village of Send when Slyfield and Guildford have empty sites and industrial units.

The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for the whole Borough not this massive allocation of 10 hectares all at Send in the Green Belt. The impact of heavy industrial lorries and vans is totally unacceptable the additional dust, dirt, noise and road gridlock is just too much.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT to Policy A58 at Burnt Common

Guildford Council have seen fit to increase industrial development on this land by increasing the MAXIMUM developable area referred to in the 2016 Plan to a MINIMUM area of 7000sq. m. in this Plan.

The Employment Land Need identifies a REDUCTION of need to 3.9 hecta across the whole Borough so how can the increase of at least 7 hectares. at OFi location, be justified?

Why not develop existing industrial land much of which is in Council ownership.

No reference has been made in the Plan to the increase of atmospheric pollution from diesel engined Heavy Goods Vehicles.

The Burnt Common roundabout is already congested by vehicles ul all types, "leapfrogging" the congestion on the A3.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

C.iii. Policy A58 Burnt Common – My Objections

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**C.iii. Policy A58 Burnt Common – My Objections**

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented."

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

I object to the potential impact of para 4.4.23a on Burnt Common with its over allocation of industrial zoning is subterfuge for a waste management facility which is a dishonest and underhand approach to planning and proper consultation.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4415  **Respondent:** 8901633 / Duncan Gray  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Now it is not a case of one or the other, but both! Since Garlick's Arch is PROVEN to be unacceptable for any form of interference, this area should become the 'fall-back' option.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4643  Respondent: 8903265 / Susan Anderson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.
15. I object to the potential impact of para 4.4.23a on Burnt Common with its over allocation of industrial zoning is subterfuge for a waste management facility which is a dishonest and underhand approach to planning and proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4658  Respondent: 8906305 / Anne Fort  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3465  Respondent: 8907137 / Jennifer A. Milligan  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to this site being included as well as Garlick’s Arch.

I feel completely let down by Guildford Borough Council who objected to the Wisley planning application, received thousands of objections when it was included in the draft Local Plan last year and yet still retain this very unsuitable site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1920  Respondent: 8907425 / Julia Wood  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3195  Respondent: 8907905 / G.A. Phillips  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )


I object to the minimum 7,000 sq m employment footspace. (Pages 144, 257-8)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
### Comment ID: pslp172/939  Respondent: 8909185 / Jamie Hogg  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**Land at Burn Common, London Road, Policy A58**

I object to Policy A58 at Burn Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
- The word ‘minimum’ is a change from the previous ‘maximum’ in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in the demand for industrial land
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse developments in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units available and unused
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
- Fails to recognise the impact of planned changes to the A3/M25 junction and increased traffic flows that will result.
- It will join up the existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

### Comment ID: pslp172/2891  Respondent: 8911873 / Tamsin Meredith  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**I object to the Policy A58, land at Burnt Common, London Road for the following reasons:**

1. This was deleted from the 2014 draft plan because of all the objections previously made – therefore why has it been included again?
2. There has been a decline in demand for industrial land since the previous draft plan but the 2016 version uses the word ‘maximum’ a change from ‘minimum’ within it – this does not make sense.
3. There are already empty sites and units at Slyfield and Guildford and therefore no need to build new industrial and warehouse developments in our area. I can only envisage these will end up being empty too.
4. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand for industrial land for the whole borough to 3.9 hectares. This policy is a huge allocation of 10 hectares for Send alone. Totally unacceptable.
5. The small roads around this area are already often at gridlock. This can only make the problem worse.
6. The merging of existing villages (which will occur) defeats the purpose of the Green Belt.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

### Comment ID: pslp172/2894  Respondent: 8911873 / Tamsin Meredith  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

---
I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned in policy 4.423a and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3175</th>
<th>Respondent: 8913985 / Lynda Newland</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to Policy A58 land at Burntcommon.

There is no evidence to support the need for more industrial warehouses on this site, especially when there are empty units in Slyfield and Guildford.

Traffic will increase on surrounding roads with large lorries causing congestion and blockage on the narrow roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4251</th>
<th>Respondent: 8914049 / Diana Bridges</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. POLICY A58

I object to this proposal A58 Burnt Common which is not defined and therefore open to interpretation. Any development of that type and on that scale will again impact the road infrastructure on the edge of two villages, Send and Ripley. In any case the need for them is unclear especially when there seems to be spare capacity at Slyfield industrial estate which is much more appropriate and already an established industrial estate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4256</th>
<th>Respondent: 8914049 / Diana Bridges</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**1. I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)**

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

There are clearly serious pollution issues to be considered as well as a massive increase in commercial traffic bringing the waste in and out.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4662  **Respondent:** 8916929 / Gillian McWilliams  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation.

15. I object to the potential impact of para 4.4.23a on Burnt Common with its over allocation of industrial zoning is subterfuge for a waste management facility which is a dishonest and underhand approach to planning and proper consultation.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4700  **Respondent:** 8919009 / Andrew Kukielka  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site.

This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.“

There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

I object to the potential impact of para 4.4.23a on Burnt Common with its over allocation of industrial zoning is subterfuge for a waste management facility which is a dishonest and underhand approach to planning and proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4505  Respondent: 8921377 / Paul Maycox  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

13. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4547  Respondent: 8921857 / Claire Kukielka  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately
half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

I object to the potential impact of para 4.4.23a on Burnt Common with its over allocation of industrial zoning is subterfuge for a waste management facility which is a dishonest and underhand approach to planning and proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3843  **Respondent:** 8923905 / Claire Bridges  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

**POLICY A58**

I object to this proposal **A58 Burnt Common** which is not defined and therefore open to interpretation. Any development of that type and on that scale will again impact the road infrastructure on the edge of two villages, Send and Ripley. In any case the need for them is unclear especially when there seems to be spare capacity at Slyfield industrial estate which is much more appropriate and already an established industrial estate.

I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.

With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become **even more** biased against the North East of the borough.

Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt.

This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

Site **A4** in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.
I object to removal of Brownfield site (A34) from the Plan

Site A44 in Broadford Business Park has also been removed. This is another brownfield site that has already been developed. The Council’s claims to “have adopted a ‘brownfield first’ approach” (page 5) and makes out this is an important aspect of the plan but this is clearly not the case, and is contrary to national guidelines.

I object the change in policy on affordable homes (Policy 4.2.23)

The previous version of the plan stated that “Developers will be expected to provide land for affordable homes at nil value”.

The 2017 version says: Off-site provision or payment in lieu is expected to enable the same amount of additional affordable housing as would have been delivered on site.”

If the developer simply builds the development they want and then makes a cash payment to the council for the affordable houses the developer does not build, how does this help Guildford Borough Council build affordable housing? This would appear to prejudice the younger generation and those needing this urgently sought type of housing.

I object to removing Send Business Park from the Green Belt (4.3.15).

Send Business Park is a very small collection of local businesses in a very rural area in the Green Belt. There can be no justification for it’s insetting (removal) from the Green Belt, and indeed GBC have not even attempted one.

Therefore no “exceptional circumstances”, as required by the NPPF can be claimed.

If further development is made on this Business Park then the same points arise as those made earlier for point 1, Clockharn Nursery site with regard to traffic issues.

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

There are clearly serious pollution issues to be considered as well as a massive increase in commercial traffic bringing the waste in and out.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The plan lacks any infrastructure proposals to support all the development. There are no proposed plans to upgrade roads or introduce new roads or links, and it is simply a plan of building additional housing and commercial facilities but expecting the current road system to support more traffic which it is incapable of doing.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object: to this site being included as well as Garlicks Arch. This is overdevelopment in the north-eastern part of the borough.

1. I object: that the draft plan has amended the 2016 wording of “up to 7,000 sq m” to “a minimum of 7,000 sq m”. This leave the site open to further expansion.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site.

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2456  **Respondent:** 8930209 / Ray Corstin  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to site A58 Burntcommon, which has now become a ‘Strategic Employment Site’. The overall burden on Send (and West Clandon) of the minimum of 7000sq m of industrial space (i.e. could be much larger) is greater than the now deleted up-to 7000 sq m from the neighbouring site A43 Garlick’s Arch. This is a net gain in traffic and congestion in this area. The proposed insetting of Send Business Park from the Green Belt indicates GBC’s increased emphasis and ambition for growth of this village.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4490  **Respondent:** 8930465 / Michael & Carol Cook  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4538  Respondent: 8939425 / Petria Hiam  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4338</th>
<th>Respondent: 8944929 / A. Jefferies</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. I object to the inclusion of policy A58 – there is no justification for an increase in additional industrial floorspace at this location or indeed particularly as there are a number of vacant industrial sites at a. Slyfield.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1025</th>
<th>Respondent: 9009153 / Lindsay Mitchell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch)

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

1. *The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh / Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, … (site allocation A25) than the Burnt Common site did”*

2. *The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”*

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore, GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.
Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included in the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Burnt Common strategic industrial employment site for light industry, storage and distribution activities. It is to be designated an Industrial Strategic Employment Site which means that it is a preferred site for industrial development including waste management facilities. The site is 9ha which it is stated allows for considerable future expansion. This will generate large amounts of traffic including heavy vehicles on the A247.

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/3747</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>9062913 / Susan Parker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site

This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

There is in fact no justification for building anymore industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented .

“There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted.

This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

I object to the potential impact of para 4.4.23a on Burnt Common with its over allocation of industrial zoning is subterfuge for a waste management facility which is a dishonest and underhand approach to planning and proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
resulting in significant delays.” And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/374  Respondent: 10447777 / J Jordan  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 land at Burnt Common, London road. This is now a new allocation which was previously dropped from the 2014 draft Plan which was again objected to by the local residents and scrapped. All the previous objections still stand. This Policy has now been reintroduced with the wording from the previous 2016 Plan changed from "a MAXIMUM of 7,000sq.ft to "a MINIMUM of 7,000 sq.ft. Just how much more development over 7,000 sq.ft is anticipated????

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/456  Respondent: 10540161 / Shelagh Smith  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A58 – Land at Burnt Common. I strongly object to the new allocation for a minimum of 7,000sq m of industrial or warehousing. This is a change from the previous ‘maximum’ in the 2016 plan. There is simply not the demand for this type of development. In addition, the roads are already plagued with too many lorries which causes disruption, damage to roads/kerbs and creates more and more pollution.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3501  Respondent: 10543937 / Sarah Wright  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 Burnt Common due to the following points:

There is no requirement for new industrial or warehouse space as there is availability at Slyfield and Guildford Industrial estates, developing in this way is pure stupidity and is just building for the sake of it.

Additionally, this site is in the Green Belt, there are no exceptional circumstances to justify development here.
According to the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment there is a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land in the whole borough. Why is there a huge allocation of 10 hectares in Send? This policy has not been thought through at all.

Generally transport evidence for this policy is incomplete and unreliable. What would happen in reality would be serious accidents, major traffic jams twice a day and therefore excessive pollution.

Any extra traffic would cause traffic chaos in the local area with its small roads, adding commercial vehicles to this would be completely unsustainable.

This site was deleted from the 2014 Local Plan due to previous objections, why has it returned?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3969  Respondent: 10551617 / L Truscott  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 which was deleted from the 2014 draft, Industrial and Warehousing in this area will have a huge impact on all the local roads. Guildford Borough Council are not in need of more Industrial units as stated by them in a recent planning application at Tithe barn Farm to replace existing storage and warehouses with a small development of houses, Slyfield Industrial Estate is not used at full capacity so there is no need to build this in the middle of the Green Belt when other Brown site are available sited in a better location with better access.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1535  Respondent: 10551841 / N C and N O Brown  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A58 Land at Burnt Common. This policy was deleted from the 2014 draft because of objections and yet inexplicably has been reintroduced.

In addition, despite a decline in demand for industrial development, the word "minimum" has been changed to "maximum" which gives carte blanche for future expansion. Green Belt should not be eroded for such a purpose particularly when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares here in Send. All this will again impact badly on traffic problems on our local roads and spoil the nature of the Green Belt and our villages of Send and Ripley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Burnt Common — policy A58,
NO NEED— FOR MORE INDUSTRIAL SITES IN SEND VILLAGE, ALREADY SLYFIELD HAVE EMPTY UNITS / SITES, WE REALLY DO NOT NEED THIS IN A GREEN BELT AREA THIS WILL ALSO ADD TO TRAFFIC GRID LOCK.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/934  Respondent: 10562049 / Ian Cameron  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

IN PARTICULAR, POLICY A58 – Land at Burnt Common
I object to changes in this particular policy, because:
1) The strongly held view locally is that this development is unnecessary, there being no actual need more warehousing and factory space sited here. But, in particular, I object to its extent being randomly changed from a maximum of 7,000 sq m, to a minimum of 7,000 sq m, that is effectively making it limitless in terms of what can be crammed on to it.
2) The development will add to already severe peak-time traffic congestion.
3) If proposed developments to Burpham are also approved, there will be only a narrow strip (about 500m) of Green Belt separating Guildford/Burpham and Send/Ripley contiguous built-up areas. This will be an unacceptable erosion of Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1220  Respondent: 10563777 / Hazel Creasey  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY A58 because it was deleted from the 2014 draft due to the number of objections and the word minimum has been changed from maximum, and since 2016 there has been a reduction in demand for industrial land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to Policy A58. Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Send

Changed from 'maximum' 7000 sq m to 'minimum' 7000 sq m of industrial or warehousing. This is not justified as there has been a decline in requirement for industrial land.

There is no need to build industrial/warehouse development on Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites.

The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares of industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

The vans and heavy goods vehicles will create traffic gridlock in the villages of Send and Ripley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4406  Respondent: 10570977 / Laura Richards  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1954  Respondent: 10581825 / A D Sussex  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

LAND AT BURNT COMMON, LONDON ROAD, POLICY A58.
I OBJECT to this Policy because;
• I must point out that it was deleted from the 2014 Plan because of all the objections and should be deleted again from the 2017 Plan
• As I’ve already said (quoting Sir Paul Beresford) Guildford Borough has empty sites available for industrial use, Slyfield is one example. The Green Belt is not the place for it.
• It would further aggravate gridlock experienced, quite frequently at Burnt Common and with the A3 intersection.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/859  Respondent: 10582145 / Iris Prole  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:

1. This development was removed from the 2014 draft as a result of the number of objections, and yet it has now been resurrected even though the demand for industrial land has actually decreased since then.
2. The new allocation for a minimum of 7,000 sqm of industrial land replaces the previous maximum. What has changed since 2016 to warrant an increase in this type of development?

Indeed, given that there are still empty industrial units at Slyfield Green and in Guildford, surely there is an argument for a reduction in Send?

1. As above, the effects on the village infrastructure, specifically the increase of traffic on small surrounding roads, will be significant.
Along with my fellow residents I beg you to reconsider the impact that this Local Plan will have on the village, and make changes accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/221  **Respondent:** 10616289 / Hilary Percy  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site A58 Burnt Common

The proposed increase in industrial floor space, plus waste management facilities in this area with its pretty, tree-lined entrance into the villages from the A3 is ill conceived. Huge amount of extra traffic, including large vehicles.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1161  **Respondent:** 10616321 / Petrina Jeffereson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1164  **Respondent:** 10616321 / Petrina Jeffereson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4215  Respondent: 10638209 / Wendy Rockhill  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

The inclusion of site A58 Burnt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch)

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

*The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm... (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]”* The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (Burnt Common and Garlicks Arch – which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives. A58 Burnt Common provides more than the “required” industrial space, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/106  Respondent: 10648353 / Hugh Proctor  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site A58 Burnt Common
I object to the change which includes this new aspect of industrial development which may involve Waste Management Facilities. It would be totally unsuited to this area and would involve very considerable additional heavy traffic on the local, overloaded, roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4647  Respondent: 10667073 / Trudi Harris  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
C.iii. Policy A58 Burnt Common – My Objections

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site.

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
with a potential for more. So there is no guarantee this won't increase. Has the need for this industrial development been demonstrated? Surely it will only create more traffic and demand for services and housing in an area that can't sustain this development on top of the new housing. Industrial development should be going away from the south-east - isn't that the whole point of HS2 and the northern powerhouse initiative.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1673  Respondent: 10701537 / Ben Gamble  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)
The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4587  Respondent: 10703745 / Frank Fuller  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2519  Respondent: 10713953 / P Smithers  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A58

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because it was deleted from the 2014 draft because of previous objections and there is no requirement in the area for a minimum of 7,000 sq m of industrial warehousing. It will impact the small surrounding roads as the traffic will be gridlocked, the Ripley exit off the A3 in both directions is already treacherous with cars speeding through the area to cut through Send and Ripley villages. There is no demand for industrial warehousing in this area when there are warehouses available and empty in Slyfield Green which is purpose built for industrial units. It will only erode the Green Belt further and join up Ripley and Send villages unnecessarily.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/657  Respondent: 10717985 / Alison Drennan  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A58

I object to Policy A58 as, following many objections made when the development was proposed in the 2014 draft Local Plan, it was deleted. It is nonsensical to now re-introduce it.
I object because there is no justification for building industrial/warehouse development in the Green Belt when empty sites and industrial units already exist in Slyfield and at Guildford.

I object as the Policy fails to take into account that the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for the whole Borough. This Policy suggests an ridiculous 10 hectares in Green Belt land in one location. This disproportionate and unjustifiable and flies in the face of need.

I object to the change of wording from maximum to minimum (minimum of 7,000 sq m of industrial or warehousing). As per my previous comment, there is no need for such development in this area at all and certainly not an increase to existing, discredited amounts, particularly given current economic uncertainty and a decreased demand for industrial land.

I object as infrastructure will not be able to support the increased traffic that will result.

I object as it will make small surrounding roads unsafe and cause traffic gridlock. I live on Potters Lane and currently even a nominal increase of traffic numbers causes traffic to come to a standstill.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/534  Respondent: 10722593 / D.C. Johnson-Webb  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A58 Burnt common because it was deleted from the 2014 draft because of the local objection. The word minimum is a change from the previous maximum in the 2016 plan. There are empty plots in Slyfield at Guildford and demand for industrial plots is on the decline. The area is again in the Green Belt. The impact of of huge heavy vehicles will destroy roads which are already in a very bad way and were never designed for the amount of heavy goods traffic already on them leave alone the extra numbers.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/606  Respondent: 10722689 / D.M. Johnson-Webb  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 Burnt common;

1) It was defeated in 2014 draft.
2) The work minimum is changed to Maximum in the draft.
3) There are already plenty of industrial sites available at Slyfield at Guildford.
4) The impact of heavy good vehicles will be phenomenal on our roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3038  Respondent: 10723553 / Judith Pound  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because it will increase traffic volumes to unacceptable levels and was previously rejected because of the number of local objections- so should not be included anyway. The word "minimum" seems like a very devious change from the previous wording of 'maximum'(how much building is going to be allowed?), especially since there is now less demand for industrial land than when 2016 Plan was drawn up. In any event I don't see the need for additional commercial developments in what is clearly a residential/rural area, in the Green Belt, especially when there are empty sites in Slyfield for example.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
**Comment ID: pslp172/3601  Respondent: 10723553 / Judith Pound  Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because it will increase traffic volumes to unacceptable levels and was previously rejected because of the number of local objections—so should not be included anyway. The word “minimum” seems like a very devious change from the previous wording of ‘maximum’ (how much building is going to be allowed?), especially since there is now less demand for industrial land than when 2016 Plan was drawn up. In any event I don’t see the need for additional commercial developments in what is clearly a residential/rural area, in the Green Belt, especially when there are empty sites in Slyfield for example.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID: pslp172/1320  Respondent: 10724897 / Hilary Sewter  Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( No ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously.
- The word “minimum” is change from the previous “maximum”, in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in the demand for industrial land.
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the WHOLE BOROUGH not an enormous OVER ALLOCATION of 10 HECTARES at Send in the GREEN BELT

ABIDE BY THE ALREADY AGREED POLICY A58 page 144

This policy is not legally compliant, or sound and does not comply with the duty to co-operate

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

ABIDE BY THE ALREADY AGREED POLICY A58 page 144

This policy is not legally compliant, or sound and does not comply with the duty to co-operate

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID: pslp172/666  Respondent: 10725729 / Annie Hotson  Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to Policy A58. There is no call for industrial buildings. So many empty at Slyfield. Cannot understand why this is even being considered. We had a large office building built along Send Road. Has now had to be turned into flats as office space was not needed. The same will happen with warehouses. Who researches the need for these building?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/663  Respondent: 10725793 / Ken Hotson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A58

There is no need to build industrial warehouses, Guildford Borough has so many unused sites and warehouses. There is no demand for them.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1957  Respondent: 10726369 / A. Watson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A58

I object to the above policy for the following reasons:

It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections but now you have chosen not only to reintroduce it but to change the stated maximum square footage to minimum. another example showing you neither listen nor care about local objection. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have vacant sites and industrial units, particularly in view of the fact that there is a decreasing demand for industrial land.

The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt. Heavy traffic associated with industrial development will again contaminate yet further the already bad air from the A3.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1224  Respondent: 10726497 / David Ian Ness  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to Policy change A58 Burnt Common
- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the local objections made earlier. How has the earlier decision been changed?
- The wording of ‘minimum’ development has been changed to ‘maximum’
- Why build on a green belt site? Guildford (Slyfield) still have empty sites available.
- Can you imagine how the increasing commercial traffic in the vicinity will gridlock many local roads and in particular the A247
- 'The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment' shows a reduction in demand of 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough of Guildford. Why should there be a need to increase the allocation of 10 hectares in Send, an area situated within the Green Belt?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2911  Respondent: 10729345 / M. Osborn  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 Land at Burnt Common allocation for a minimum of 7,000 square meters of industrial warehousing. The allocation for a minimum of 7,000 square meters of industrial warehousing is major expansion and overdevelopment. It will increase traffic and pollution on the A247.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4006  Respondent: 10729537 / Julia Osborn  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

4). I **object** to Policy A58 Land at Burnt Common allocation for a minimum of 7,000 square meters of industrial warehousing.

4.1) **I object** because this would be a major development expansion and it **would be inconsistent with the Settlement Hierarchy 2014** which identifies Send as a ‘large village’ and according to paragraph 3.4.2 of this document large villages are unsuitable for substantial growth but capable of accommodating an extension. In GBC’s Green Belt and Countryside Study Volume 5 (April 2014) it was concluded that the land at Burnt Common was more suitable as a housing site (in comparison to Garlicks Arch). The original proposals for housing at the land around Burnt Common were therefore more consistent with a large village “accommodating an expansion”. Policy A58 is not consistent with the classification of Send as a large village with GBC’s Settlement Hierarchy 2014 and it would be overdevelopment of a village situated in the Green Belt.

4.2) **I object** because **there is not adequate infrastructure in place** to service A58 as a major development site.
4.3) I object because Highways England have not agreed to any plans to development the A3 between Burnt Common and Guildford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1367  Respondent: 10731361 / Joan Bagnall  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I further object to Policy A58. The increase in the planned industrial units and warehousing is inappropriate when there are empty sites at Slyfield and contrary to the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment which shows a reduction in the requirements in the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2415  Respondent: 10732193 / Leslie Bowerman  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to this proposal as it was deleted from the 2014 draft because of the number of objections previously lodged and nothing relevant his since happened.

I object because the word ‘maximum’ for industrial use (which was more than enough already) has unbelievably been altered to ‘minimum’ which means that there would be an obligatory 7000 square feet of building on the site and no top limit to the industrial buildings allowed in the new plan. This cannot be right when there has been a decline in the demand for industrial land.

I object because this site was deleted from the 2014 draft as a result of all the objections. It cannot now be right that it has now been reinstated greatly enlarged. Something very sinister must be going on for this to be done.

I object because there is absolutely no need to build industrial or warehouse buildings in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford have empty sites and industrial units. One wonders what is going on.

I object because the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole Borough, not a huge over-allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt. Again, it appears that a huge unnecessary project is being proposed to destroy this beautiful part of the Green Belt, to nobody’s benefit but those with an interest in development.

I object to this proposal because it will lead to gridlock both on small local roads and on the Guildford By-pass.

I object to this proposal because it will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1567  Respondent: 10733409 / Ruth Hunter  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the Policy A58. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites an industrial units. The impact on our small roads will create traffic gridlock and be dangerous for the many children who walk and cycle to and from school and the local playgrounds.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1568  Respondent: 10733409 / Ruth Hunter  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the Policy A58. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites an industrial units. The impact on our small roads will create traffic gridlock and be dangerous for the many children who walk and cycle to and from school and the local playgrounds.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1845  Respondent: 10733921 / Pamela Maynard  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 which requests allocation for a minimum of 7,000sq.m. of industrial or warehousing. There is not a requirement for this sort of space as demand has been declining and the increase in traffic movement will just add to what is becoming a chaotic area for road travel. I work within an industrial warehousing complex and know of the problems that arise from this sort of development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2873  Respondent: 10741729 / Jean Page  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

I object to Policy A58 which requests allocation for a minimum of 7,000sq.m. of industrial or warehousing. There is not a requirement for this sort of space as demand has been declining and the increase in traffic movement will just add to what is becoming a chaotic area for road travel. I work within an industrial warehousing complex and know of the problems that arise from this sort of development.
I object to Policy A58 for the following reasons:-

It seems that having been deleted from the 2014 draft due to all the objections raised, this proposal has magically been put back in again, however since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. The need for “industrial land” has yet to be demonstrated. It is the case that both Slyfield and Guildford have empty sites and industrial units available.

The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in industrial demand to 3.9 hectares for the whole borough not a huge allocation of 10 hectares at Send in The Green Belt. The already existing problems with regard to traffic congestion will become ever more problematic and gridlock is sure to be created. Villages which are currently unique and sensitive to the needs of their own communities will be joined up and negate the whole concept of the green belt as well as destroying the many and valuable services provided mostly voluntarily by residents from these communities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because the impact on the small surrounding roads will add to already overstretched roads in the area. There have been no appreciable improvements to the local infrastructure in the last forty years. Roads are grid locked every time there is a problem at the M25 Junction 10. In one recent week that was on three days. This is damaging businesses locally.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Send Road is at maximum capacity every rush hour. The road through West Clandon cannot take two lorries passing each other without one having to mount the pavement. The narrowest part of The Street is close to a junior school. There is no chance of widening these roads without having to purchase local private property.

The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough, not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares in the Green Belt in Send.

It is quite clear that the whole basis of your plan for the Send area is politically motivated as neither of our councillors are Conservatives. This is totally unacceptable and has been noted by the electorate locally.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to the proposals to provide an allocation for a minimum of 7,000 sq m of industrial or warehousing on the land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A58, for the following reasons:

- This was deleted from the 2014 draft based on previous objections, why should it be resurfaced when there is no need to build industrial or warehouse space in the middle of the Green Belt? Guildford and Slyfield have empty sites and industrial units already, the requirement for more space does not exist.
• Since the 2016 plan there has been a decline in demand for industrial land (as proven in the point above re: empty units)
• The 2017 employment land need assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares in Send in the Green Belt
• Infrastructure cannot support this. Traffic and pollution levels are already a major problem
• By joining up the villages there would be no definition between Ripley & Send defeating the purpose of the Green Belt

Yet again, having to write to raise objections to an ill-considered plan that has not been amended, despite the volume of previous objections, really demonstrates a lack of competence in this space. It is infuriating to local residents who yet again have to ‘go into battle’ with a local council that clearly is not listening to the community, it’s a complete disgrace.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2813  Respondent: 10756961 / Carol Marsh  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site A58 Burnt Common

- The potential for a substantial increase in industrial floorspace from 7000 sq m to an unspecified amount at the site A58 Burnt Common does not provide local residents with enough information for a full and proper consultation given the ambiguity and lack of detail within the document.

- The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, tucked away in policy 4.4.23a and does not allow for full and proper consultation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/462  Respondent: 10764385 / E.E Whearley  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

1. The demand for industrial and/or warehouse sites declined.
2. Where is proof of need when Slyfields and Guildford have empty sites and industrial units.
3. Why destroy Green Belt land unnecessarily
4. The traffic impact will be disastrous to the local roads through Send, Ripley and Clandon. Gridlock inevitable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**Comment ID:** pslp172/2096  **Respondent:** 10765249 / Andy & Sonja Freebody  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Burnt Common strategic industrial employment site for light industry, storage and distribution activities. It is to be designated an Industrial Strategic Employment Site which means that it is a preferred site for industrial development including waste management facilities. The site is 9ha which it is stated allows for considerable future expansion. This will generate large amounts of traffic including heavy vehicles on the A247.

1. I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A58 Burnt Common warehouse why does the area need an additional industrial estate when we are so close to Slyfield.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3313  Respondent: 10773409 / Anne Monk  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Thirdly, I object to policy A58 of a minimum of 7,000 sq m of industrial warehousing because of the change from ‘maximum’ in the previous plan to ‘minimum’ in the current plan despite a decline in the demand. This is proven by empty sights in Slyfield and Guildford which should all be filled first. The 2017 Employment Land need assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough so why has Send been earmarked a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in green belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3167  Respondent: 10773825 / Pierre Foskett  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A58 Land at Burnt Common, London Road. This proposal has been changed repeatedly in the local plan since 2014, there is clear uncertainty over its suitability. This is a large allocation of green belt land for industrial use which fails to follow NFFP, in particular chapt 11: ‘Conserving and enhancing the natural environment’. The impact of increased traffic in the local area from the increase of industrial use on this site will affect the heath and environment of the resident of both Send and Ripley. There are inadequate transport links (e.g rail) and the air pollution and safety on local roads will deteriorate, already the main concerns to local residents of Send and Ripley. Any development on this site will increase these issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1763  Respondent: 10774881 / Kate Cheyne  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
(3) I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:

This proposal was previously deleted from the 2014 draft as a result of the objections. I’m unclear as to why these have now been ignored. I object to these changes in the latest draft local plan on the basis that:

1. This is an area with prolific birds and wildlife
2. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when only a few miles away Slyfield and Guildford are under utilised (they still have empty sites and industrial units)

1. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough. The proposal is out of kilter with this demand.
2. The impact on small surrounding roads will create more traffic problems in an area already struggling
3. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: psp172/2405  Respondent: 10775137 / Wendy Lodge  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 Burnt Common, London Road

It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously

There is already land at Slyfield that was planned to take further industry but this has been ignored. Send is a village, separated from Ripley and Send Marsh by narrow but important areas of green belt and will lose all character if these are built over. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

The word "minimum" is a change from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: psp172/1988  Respondent: 10776033 / Prue Robinson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A58
I object most strongly to the changes made to Policy A58
These are my reasons:
This Policy A58 was in fact deleted from the 2014 draft because of the number of objections and I see that since then you not only reinstated the plan in 2016, despite a decline in demand for industrial land and have also replaced the word 'maximum' with 'minimum'.
The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough. The industrial and warehouse areas at Slyfield and Guildford have empty sites and industrial units so your immense over allocation of 10 hectares at Send, in Green Belt is incomprehensible to me. I do not understand why this is needed especially as the impact on the narrow surrounding roads already crowded with tail backs in rush hour periods and would most certainly become gridlocked. Creating one mass of clogged roads and over development will completely defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/297  Respondent: 10781505 / Donna Joyce  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In summary I totally OBJECT to this and policy A58 Burnt Common, Industrial warehousing REALLY???? and its right next door to Garlicks arch so basically an expansion of that, again it will cause gridlock on the morning commute then add in the almost daily accident on the already failing A3 and we who need to get to work may as well just simply go home.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2940  Respondent: 10784769 / Jane Baker  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A58
Now a NEW allocation for a minimum of 7000 sc m. of industrial warehousing.
I object to policy A58 at Burnt Common because:
It was DELETED from the first draft because of all the previous objections and should therefore NOT have been reintroduced.
There is no need to build an industrial development on Green Belt when sites still exist at Slyfield and Guildford. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a REDUCTION in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land NOT a huge over allocation of 10 hectares on Send Green Belt land.
The impact on already busy roads will cause gridlock, especially when the A3 is blocked and traffic tries to get down the slip road and through Ripley and Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp172/1577  Respondent: 10786113 / John Creasey  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I also OBJECT TO POLICY A58 because it was deleted from the 2014 draft due to the number of objections and the word minimum has been changed from maximum, and since 2016 there has been a reduction in demand for industrial land.

Guildford and Slyfield have empty sites and industrial units so this should be used.

The 2017 Employment Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand for industrial land for the whole Borough.

This will generate a huge increase in traffic and cause gridlock on the local roads. The green belt is precious and should be protected. All this development needs new infrastructure such as additional sewage works. Can the Doctors surgery cope with the additional people. Are the schools capable of accepting the additional children. I understand there will be a shortage of places for children above infants schools. What is being done in the plan to cover the situation with Doctors surgery and Schools.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/771  Respondent: 10793281 / Paul Woodington  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

• There is absolutely no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt. There are empty sites remaining at Slyfield and Guildford.

• Because of all the objections made previously, this was deleted from the 2014 draft.

• The 2016 plan has changed the word "minimum" to "maximum" and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. In fact, the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough, NOT a huge over-allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

• The traffic, which is already too heavy, will be vastly increased.

• The existing villages will be joined up and the Green Belt lost.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/5074  Respondent: 10796417 / Richard Shenton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
5. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
6. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
7. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
8. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
9. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.
10. I object to the potential impact of para 4.4.23a on Burnt Common with its over allocation of industrial zoning is subterfuge for a waste management facility which is a dishonest and underhand approach to planning and proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2632  Respondent: 10798369 / Gail Hollis  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 Land at Burnt Common Send because:

1. a) It had been deleted from the 2014 draft There Local Plan because of all the objections previously made.
1. b) There are empty sites and industrial units at Slyfield and Guildford therefore there is no need to build warehouse or industrial development in the middle of the green belt.

1. c) The impact on the small surrounding roads will be intolerable and create traffic gridlock. It is like this most of the time anyway especially if there are problems on the A3 or M25.
1. d) The employment land Need Assessment (2017) shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares in Send on the Green Belt.
1. e) The word "minimum" is a change from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan and since then there has been a decline in demand for industrial land.
1. f) This over development will join up existing villages and defeat the object of the Green Belt.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1186  Respondent: 10798977 / Ian Brooks  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/944  Respondent: 10799489 / Shai Sinai  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy a58 at Burntcommon;

It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of objections but now has been re-added to the plan, along with Garlick's arch which previously replaced it. Even worse, the word minimum has been changed to maximum, despite a decline in demand for industrial land. Why plan an industrial development in the middle of the greenbelt, when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty units? The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough, not an excessive allocation of 10 hectares at Send, once again, this is green belt land and should not be built on. The increased traffic caused by this development and the Garlick's arch development and the new A3 junction will choke our village to death with congestion.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1644  Respondent: 10800673 / Nigel Rowland  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A58.

Now a new allocation for a minimum of 7,000 sq m of industrial or warehousing
I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously

- The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land

- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units

- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt

- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock

- It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1930  Respondent: 10805537 / Robert Mote  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
- The word "minimum" is a change from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock. The Old Portsmouth Road is regularly breaking up, and additional HGV traffic will exacerbate this, especially when couple with the other parts of the Plan
- It will join up existing villages, further reducing local identity and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt (Policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15) because:

- It is effectively an old non-conforming use in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation
- There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions. Previous points regarding traffic impact on Tannery Lane, Papercourt Lane and the A247 apply here, and the addition of more HGV traffic will cause significant impact and generate a "ticking time bomb" for accidents
- Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate

I wish for all my objections to be taken into consideration.

Whilst not specific to a particular Plan clause, I would also like my strong objection registered to way that the Council has yet again handled this process, and how you continue to fail Guildford residents by failing to apply proper planning process.

Furthermore, and despite Send being responsible for a high number of the 32,000 objections to the 2016 plan, the Council appears to have ignored all the opinions of Send residents and proposed a plan which clearly ignores the norms and conventions of the local planning process. This should have seen a revised plan that took those opinions & objections into account, however the 2017 plan clearly shows the opposite and forces our area to disproportionately shoulder the burden to meet the understandable need for more housing.

This new plan targets valued green belt and completely ignores the inadequate infrastructure which is incapable of supporting such a large expansion of the settlement. The Council, in choosing to consistently ignore the ultimate and inevitable impacts, has shown at the least a woeful disregard for the resident’s needs, and worst an active and vindictive attitude towards Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to this "revised" policy. Having been deleted from the earlier draft in response to all the objection made, I most strongly object to this new application with the change of wording from "maximum" to "minimum" this policy would give free rein to planners to create another "Slyfield". While the aforesaid has plenty of sites and industrial units empty. Furthermore the Employment Land Need Assessment of 2017 shows a REDUCTION in demand of 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the WHOLE borough not this vast over allocation of 10 hectares at SEND, A GREEN BELT AREA. There would be an intolerable overload on our small roads, not to mention the accompanying increase in pollution, which is already at excessive levels.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/519  Respondent: 10806465 / Moya Miller  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Now on to A58 Burnt Common.

I object to the proposal to utilise 7,000 sq.ft for industrial & warehousing.

Dont make this beautiful area into another Slyfield - that is what it would become and traffic would be worsened by the large lorries during daytime and early morning.. Where do you propose they gain access? Dont say the new road plan will be sufficient to cater for it all.

Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 - Guildford Borough Council Planning Policy Consultations

All the above building is planned on the GREEN BELT which goes against all the previous promises to keep England Green.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2437  Respondent: 10807745 / Belinda Middleton  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1) This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

2) The Plan calls for a minimum of 7000 sq. m. (0.7 ha, previously in the 2016 Plan a maximum figure) but the proposal is to take 9.26 hectares out of the Green Belt. There is no proper justification given for taking the additional land.

3) The evidence base does not support this scale of additional industrial space and the justification for placing it in the Green Belt is not made out. If the quality of some existing industrial provision is not adequate this should cause re-development of it not a large encroachment into the Green Belt.
The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a demand of 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Burnt Common in the Green Belt.

4) The reference to waste management facilities mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and should not be so casually included for this site.

5) The proposal for light industry, storage, distribution and waste management activities at Burnt Common will generate large amounts of traffic including heavy vehicles on the A247.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/821  
Respondent: 10807969 / Sarra Martin  
Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I also object to Policy A58 - why do we need additional industrial premises at Burnt Common, when I know that there are empty industrial units available in Guildford.

I urge you to please reconsider your approach to our local area. It seems you are set on destroying green belt and wiping out the character of Surrey villages, damaging wild life and reducing health and wellbeing, by removing green spaces in which to walk.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4735  
Respondent: 10811361 / Simon Crago  
Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

C.iii. Policy A58 Burnt Common

1. I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
3. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
4. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
5. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
6. It will create poor air quality.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp172/2576  Respondent: 10812289 / Deborah Clover  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the changes to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because GBC have changed this from a maximum of 7,000 sq m of industrial space to a MINIMUM of 7,000 sq m of industrial space. There is simply no need to build industrial or warehouse sites in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield & Guildford still have empty sites. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment actually show a reduction in demand for industrial land to 3.9 hectares, so why has GBC over allocated a minimum of 10 hectares at Send alone? The impact on surrounding roads will cause gridlock & Send & Ripley will be joined up as one. This proposal was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections, not to mention the thousands of objections logged last year. Why is GBC not listening?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3008  Respondent: 10813345 / Ruth Cope  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
- The word "minimum" is a change from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
- It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3171  Respondent: 10813345 / Ruth Cope  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
• The word "minimum" is a change from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land

• There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units

• The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt

• The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock

• It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/240  Respondent: 10815681 / Penelope Corlett  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A58 Land at Burnt Common, Send.

I object, in that this had previously been deleted from the 2014 Draft owing to the objections raised and there is no demand for industrial land in the middle of Green Belt when there are still empty sites at Slyfield. Once again the traffic generated would cause gridlock on already very congested roads. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment show a reduction in demand for the whole borough to 3.9 hectares and to over allocate 10 hectares to Send is entirely disproportionate.

I trust my views will be taken into consideration and await your acknowledgement of this letter.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1638  Respondent: 10816481 / Jeff Waine  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at burnt Common. it was already deleted from the 2014 draft because of objections. Slyfield still has empty sites and units, you again are willing to put aside the green belt for your own gain damaging the environment and wildlife, when industrial, sites shows a reduction in need. More traffic gridlock.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common. It was already deleted from the 2014 draft due to objections. Slyfield still has empty sites and units, you again are willing to put aside the green belt for your own gain damaging the environment and wildlife, when industrial, sites shows a reduction in need. More traffic gridlock. Lastly I object to the Green belt policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15, i.e. to inset Send Business park from the Green Belt, there is restricted access in Tannery lane, both ways and further expansion would harm the outstanding countryside, through pollination and building.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4693  **Respondent:** 10816513 / Annmarie Shenton  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potentially newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/134  Respondent: 10816705 / Maggie Cole  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

6. The potential for a substantial increase in industrial floor space from 7000 sq m to an unspecified amount at the site A58 Burnt Common does not provide local residents with sufficient information for a full and proper consultation given the ambiguity and lack of detail within the document. Also the increase in heavy traffic is unmanageable within the local roads and lane
7. The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.4.23a and does not allow for full and proper consultation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3414  Respondent: 10817601 / Gerald Watson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the above policy for the following reasons:

It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections but now you have chosen not only to reintroduce it but to change the stated maximum square footage to minimum: another example showing you neither listen nor care about local objection. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have vacant sites and industrial units, particularly in view of the fact that there is a decreasing demand for industrial land.

The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt. Heavy traffic associated with industrial development will again contaminate yet further the already bad air from the A3.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp172/3192  Respondent: 10817633 / M Mansbridge  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to POLICY A58, BURNT COMMON: because there is no need for excessive amounts of industrial and warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt - see the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/580  Respondent: 10818177 / Heather Coussens  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 Land at Burnt Common, London Road. See below

Our villages of Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common & Ripley are green sites in residential areas not industrial sites with attached villages. This is not the right area to create an industrial estate full of warehouses and industrial units. Along with workers, litter and pollution. We do not want big articulated lorries thundering past day and night. Furthermore, I am troubled to see the new policy is advocating a ‘minimum’ amount of land which can increase if required. When the idea of an industrial estate in our villages was first suggested on paper in the 2014 draft the word ‘maximum’ was incorporated though thankfully as a plan it was withdrawn from the draft due to the number of objections. Note also the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment which has shown a reduction in the demand for industrial land. Our villages should not be subjected to an open ended policy on the final number. So why bring it back.

The area as a whole struggles daily with traffic gridlock. With the added chaos of all A3 problems making all our local roads a natural detour. Pollution rates will rise increasing health risks to all the people in the vicinity.

Keep the area green.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1709  Respondent: 10818529 / John Hales  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to Policy A58 Land at Burnt Common, London Rd.

The proposed industrial development of a minimum of 7000sqm is not required as the latest employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 (ELNA) shows a reduction in demand of 3.9 hectares for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares in the Green Belt in Send. The word minimum is a change from the previous maximum in the 2016 plan. If there is a need why can't this be provided on the Slyfield or other industrial estates in the borough which still have empty sites, instead of building on Green Belt land.

The villages of Send, Send Marsh and Burnt Common are currently not well served by public transport to the main conurbations of Guildford and Woking and the additional housing, and industrial units will therefore result in a substantial increase in local traffic, air pollution, parking problems, and increased accidents in these villages. As there are no significant infrastructure improvements described in any detail in the proposal to mitigate the effect of the development sites the proposal presents a significant risk of overloading the current infrastructure in Send.

What impact will the additional traffic have on the surrounding roads in Send and Ripley and on the A3 which is already overcapacity at peak times in this area?

This development site will also result in loss of wildlife in this beautiful unspoilt part of Surrey with its diverse birdlife. Have any wildlife and environmental impact assessments been carried out on any of these sites?

What additional facilities are planned to cope with the increased demand for school places, doctors and emergency services from the increase in the population?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to the Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
- The word “minimum” is changed from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse developments in the middle of the green belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt
- The impact on the small surrounding country roads will create traffic gridlock which has happened before with incidents on the M25 with people stuck in cars for 5 hours or more going no where
- It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY A58-LAND AT BURNT COMMON, LONDON ROAD

Is there the need for in excess of 7000 square metres of industrial buildings and/or warehousing—the existing businesses create a lot of traffic movement (thus pollution) and the road seems to be a permanent car and lorry park. If additional vehicles are attracted, they will have to cross the Send/Ripley slip road where the traffic leaves the A3 at high speed, with the likelihood of serious accidents due to slow moving, heavy lorries having to traverse both lanes. This proposal was deleted from the 2014 draft plan because of the local objections raised at the time. If the planners took heed then, why try to re-introduce them now as the objections still apply.

There still seems to be plenty of space available for this kind of development at Slyfield Green and Guildford without taking away Green Belt land in Send. Also, the recent Employment Land Need Assessment showed a reduction in demand for this type of development so why does GBC want to allow this unrequired over-allocation at the expense of our village?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2809  Respondent: 10826209 / David Rider  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the new allocation of a minimum of 7,000 square metre for industrial or warehousing use. I understand this was deleted from the 2014 plan, based on objections made at the time, so it is totally unacceptable to re-introduce into the latest draft Plan. I strongly object to the use of the word “minimum”, as Plans need to be capped rather than act as licence for uncontrolled expansion of the area. It is also unnecessary to build industrial plots on existing green belt area, where there is capacity to expand existing industrial areas such as Slyfield. The increase in commercial traffic around the Burnt Common area will cause inevitable gridlock and place an unacceptable burden on local residents, as traffic will need to use the small Burnt Common roundabout.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3154  Respondent: 10828737 / Claire Dawson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch)

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were
a) The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, … (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]”
b) The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”
Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available and therefore there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3158  Respondent: 10828737 / Claire Dawson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)
The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. The Council has a duty of transparency especially regarding such highly contentious issues. It appears the Council is neglecting its duty?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2404  Respondent: 10828961 / Carey Lodge  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 Burnt Common, London Road

It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously

There is already land at Slyfield that was planned to take further industry but this has been ignored. Send is a village, separated from Ripley and Send Marsh by narrow but important areas of green belt and will lose all character if these are built over. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

The word "minimum" is a change from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Burnt Common, Policy A58

I object to the new allocation of a minimum of 7,000 square metre for industrial or warehousing use. I understand this was deleted from the 2014 plan, based on objections made at the time, so it is totally unacceptable to re-introduce into the latest draft Plan. I strongly object to the use of the word “minimum”, as Plans need to be capped rather than act as licence for uncontrolled expansion of the area. It is also unnecessary to build industrial plots on existing green belt area, where there is capacity to expand existing industrial areas such as Slyfield. The increase in commercial traffic around the Burnt Common area will cause inevitable gridlock and place an unacceptable burden on local residents, as traffic will need to use the small Burnt Common roundabout.

I do hope my objections will receive due consideration in arriving at the final Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1893</th>
<th>Respondent: 10830753 / AJ Cheeseman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ) is Sound? ( ) is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously;

The word ‘minimum’ is a change from the previous ‘maximum’ in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land;

There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford have empty sites and industrial units – use them first;

The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt;

The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock and extra air and noise pollution from heavy goods vehicles.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2756</th>
<th>Respondent: 10830785 / PE Whatley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ) is Sound? ( ) is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the proposal A58 to change the wording of the proposed industrial area at Burnt Common form a maximum of 7000 sq ft to a minimum of 7000 sq ft because this removes any upper limit and opens the door to any size of development in the future, with all the traffic mayhem that brings. With sites at Slyfield and in Guildford sitting empty, where is the need for this scale of industrial development?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/813</th>
<th>Respondent: 10830977 / Nick Ware</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ) is Sound? ( ) is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously;

The word ‘minimum’ is a change from the previous ‘maximum’ in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land;

There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford have empty sites and industrial units – use them first;

The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt;

The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock and extra air and noise pollution from heavy goods vehicles.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
We have lived at the above address, adjacent to Burnt common roundabout for just over 30 years, and are deeply concerned at the ever-increasing amount of traffic passing within 8 feet of our house. This consists, in part, of daily rat-run traffic speeding through Ripley village trying to jump the A3 traffic queue up to the M25. This is occurring every weekday morning throughout the year.

We object most strongly to the inevitable increase in HGV traffic that would result if the Burnt Common Distribution Site (Policy A58) development should be permitted to go ahead. Ripley is plagued with a massive amount of HGV traffic already, and can take no more. The only solution to that problem would be for direct access to that site from the proposed 4-way Clandon Road / A3 interchange, not via Burnt Common roundabout.

Traffic is already a serious issue in the Send/Burnt Common/Ripley area, and even at present levels, we are experiencing significant health issues, indisputably caused by traffic exhaust fumes.

We therefore, support the following objections:

Garlick's Arch (Policy A43), Burnt Common (Policy A58) and Policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15 as set out below:

We object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because it would be disastrous for Send and the (A247) would be gridlocked all day, made worse by the already difficult and dangerous crossover into the Little Waitrose lorry delivery point and customer car.

We object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3164  **Respondent:** 10831681 / James Cope  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
- The word "minimum" is a change from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
- It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3101  **Respondent:** 10832129 / Christopher Lawrence  **Agent:**

---
I also object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:
It was deleted from 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously. The word minimum' is a change from the previous 'Maximum' in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford have empty sites and industrial units. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt. Once again the impact on surrounding village roads will produce gridlock.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1000  Respondent: 10836033 / Katherine Gervasio  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the substantial increase in industrial floor space at Site A58 Burnt Common from 7000sq metres to an unspecified amount. This does not give local residents enough information for a full and proper consultation given the ambiguity and lack of detail within the document.

I object to the potential for a Waste Management Facility at Site A58 Burnt Common. It is obscurely mentioned in policy 4.423a and does not allow for full and proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/885  Respondent: 10837313 / Mary Jane Gray  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed changes under Policy A58 of the Plan for a new minimum allocation of 7000m2 of Industrial and Warehousing on land at Burnt Common. Development of this area was deleted from the 2014 draft of the Local Plan due to the number of objections received and I can see no justification for its reintroduction in this Plan. GBC are implored to exhaust the development of all existing available industrial sites within the Borough before introducing new sites within Green Belt areas that are to the detriment of the community as a whole.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2430  Respondent: 10837665 / J.H. Lakeman  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A58 at Burnt Common because the volumes of previous objections caused it to be deleted from the 2014 draft and the 2016 plan's "maximum" has been changed to "minimum" despite the decline in demand for industrial usage evidenced by the 2017 Employment Land need assessment reduction to 3.9 hectares for the whole borough NOT supporting a massive allocation of 10 hectares at Send with the resultant destruction of the Green Belt and increased traffic problems, all this despite empty site and industrial units at Slyfield and Guildford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/802  Respondent: 10839233 / Sheila Harris  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed changes of a new allocation for a minimum of 7000m2 of Industrial or Warehousing on Land at Burnt Common under Policy A58 of the Plan. Development of this area was deleted from the 2014 draft of the Local Plan due to the number of objections raised previously. I would question whether the present demand for Industrial Land is such that there is a need to develop Green Belt land at all let alone change the requirements on this site from a 'maximum' under the 2016 Proposed Plan to a 'minimum' development area under this Plan. I therefore request that GBC explore the development of all existing industrial sites within the Guildford area such as those that are currently available at Slyfield before introducing new industrial sites within the Green Belt areas.

I therefore re-iterate my strongest objection to the local Plan 2017 for Send in its current form and insist that Guildford Borough Council reconsider the proposals accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/614  Respondent: 10839393 / F.A. Howell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A58- Land at Burnt Common, London Road

I OBJECT TO POLICY A58 AT BURNT COMMON because there is already an established industrial area at Slyfield- why cant this be developed?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/803  Respondent: 10839649 / Lawrence Harris  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
I object to the proposed changes of a new allocation for a **minimum** of 7000m² of Industrial or Warehousing on Land at Burnt Common under Policy A58 of the Plan. Development of this area was deleted from the 2014 draft of the Local Plan due to the number of objections raised previously. I would question whether the present demand for Industrial Land is such that there is a need to develop Green Belt land at all let alone change the requirements on this site from a 'maximum' under the 2016 Proposed Plan to a 'minimum' development area under this Plan. I therefore request that GBC explore the development of all existing industrial sites within the Guildford area such as those that are currently available at Slyfield before introducing new industrial sites within the Green Belt areas.

I therefore re-iterate my strongest objection to the local Plan 2017 for Send in its current form and insist that Guildford Borough Council reconsider the proposals accordingly.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1549  **Respondent:** 10840321 / J.A. Manlow  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3211  **Respondent:** 10840769 / Rosemarie Haxton  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

---
The impact on surrounding roads will create traffic chaos and join up Send and Ripley to defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4151  Respondent: 10843521 / Yvonne Woozley  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A58.

Now a new allocation for a minimum of 7,000 sq m of industrial or warehousing

I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
- The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land.
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
- It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/295  Respondent: 10843585 / Jackie Payne  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to Policy A58 regarding land at Burnt Common. There is no need to build an industrial development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units. The impact of such a development at Burnt Common will again have impact on small surrounding roads and there will be traffic gridlock. The roads in Send and Ripley will not be able to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/172  Respondent: 10844673 / James Purkiss  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I very strongly object to policy A58 because there is absolutely no need for more industrial sites in this residential area. What are the planners thinking? Are you just throwing things at a map? Slyfield caters sufficiently and I understand is not at capacity. Again the traffic implications seem to have been overlooked by the planners or ignored. Incompetent or negligent, I don't know.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3810  Respondent: 10844929 / Maureen Wright  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 Burnt Common due to the following points:

There is no requirement for new industrial or warehouse space as there is availability at Slyfield and Guildford Industrial estates, developing in this way is pure stupidity and is just building for the sake of it.

Additionally, this site is in the Green Belt, there are no exceptional circumstances to justify development here.

According to the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment there is a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land in the whole borough. Why is there a huge allocation of 10 hectares in Send? This policy has not been thought through at all.

Generally transport evidence for this policy is incomplete and unreliable. What would happen in reality would be serious accidents, major traffic jams twice a day and therefore excessive pollution.

Any extra traffic would cause traffic chaos in the local area with its small roads, adding commercial vehicles to this would be completely unsustainable.

This site was deleted from the 2014 Local Plan due to previous objections, why has it returned?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2570  Respondent: 10846145 / Phillipa Bottomley  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and the change of “maximum” to “minimum” as there is no commercial case for such a development (reference empty units at Slyfield) and this change ignores all previous comments that caused its withdrawal from the 2014 draft. This development in conjunction with A42, A43 and the new interchange onto the A3 at Burntcommon all acting as a gateway in to Woking and the train system will blight the area to gridlock.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
### Comment ID: pslp172/384  Respondent: 10846241 / John Ford  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because it was taken out of the 2014 draft due to the number of previous objections. We do not require industrial development in this Green Belt area when Slyfield and Guildford have empty sites and industrial units.

Further the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand for industrial land in this borough especially as the proposal indicates a minimum (not maximum as previously proposed) allocation of 10 hectares on Sends Green Belt. The proposal will create further traffic congestion on the narrow roads in this area.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

### Comment ID: pslp172/4038  Respondent: 10847521 / Andrew Procter  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. **I object** to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site.

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building anymore industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current
planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

1.9 The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

1.10 The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

1.11 It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

1.12 The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

1.13 The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

1.14 The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

1.15 I object to the potential impact of para 4.4.23a on Burnt Common with its over allocation of industrial zoning is subterfuge for a waste management facility which is a dishonest and underhand approach to planning and proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/152  Respondent: 10848513 / Martin Cole  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- The potential for a substantial increase in industrial floor space from 7000 sq m to an unspecified amount at the site A58 Burnt Common does not provide local residents with sufficient information for a full and proper consultation given the ambiguity and lack of detail within the document. Also the increase in heavy traffic is unmanageable within the local roads and lanes
- The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.4.23a and does not allow for full and proper consultation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3611  Respondent: 10849761 / Tony Beresford  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the Policy A58 at Burnt Common because, The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/509  **Respondent:** 10851745 / Natalie Green  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:

The impact on small roads throughout Send will cause gridlock in the village

It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously

There are empty sites and industrial units at Slyfield and it therefore not necessary to build on the green belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3134  **Respondent:** 10852289 / Barry Scott  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**Land at Burn Common, London Road, Policy A58**

I object to Policy A58 at Burn Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
- The word minimum is a change from the previous maximum in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in the demand for industrial land
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse developments in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
- It will join up the existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/521  **Respondent:** 10853249 / Evan Parry-Morris  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

a) It had previously been deleted from the 2014 draft because of previous objections.
b) Since the 2016 plan there has been a decline in demand for industrial land, so it is objectionable that the word ‘maximum’ has been changed to ‘minimum’.
c) There is no need to build industrial units on Green Belt land when there are empty sites at Slyfield.
d) The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for the whole borough, not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
e) Increased traffic will cause gridlock on local roads.
f) Adjacent villages will be joined, defeating the purpose of Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word "minimum" is a change from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that "there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented."

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
As there are currently empty sites and units at Slyfield and Guildford there is no reason to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt land.

The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not an over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

The impact on surrounding roads will create traffic chaos and join up Send and Ripley to defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3833  Respondent: 10859489 / Jennifer Procter  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1 POLICY A58 BURNT COMMON

1.1 I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site.

1.2 This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

1.3 The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

1.4 There is in fact no justification for building anymore industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

1.5 There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

1.6 The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

1.7 The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

1.8 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
1.9 The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

1.10 The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

1.11 It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

1.12 The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

1.13 The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

1.14 The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

1.15 I object to the potential impact of para 4.4.23a on Burnt Common with its over allocation of industrial zoning is subterfuge for a waste management facility which is a dishonest and underhand approach to planning and proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2557</th>
<th>Respondent: 10859809 / Mary Branson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strongly object to Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no need to build industrial or warehouse developments in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford have empty sites and industrial units. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough, not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2403</th>
<th>Respondent: 10861217 / Lesley Mantell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy A58 will add to Send’s woes by more heavy vehicles blocking and damaging the roads and making it more unsafe for our children and more importantly their health.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2447</th>
<th>Respondent: 10861217 / Lesley Mantell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because there are sites that are empty at Slyfield and Guildford. I cannot believe that suggestions to use green belt land when brown field sites are up and running. The amount of heavy traffic using Send as a cut through to and from Woking is diabolical and to add to this nightmare would be a disgrace.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2532</th>
<th>Respondent: 10866721 / Andy Court</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to Policy A58 because;

1/Why build industrial/warehouse development on green belt

2/Again it will cause additional traffic including heavy goods wrecking the already pot holed roads.

3/Defeats the purpose of green belt

Being a local home owner I am totally bemused that again the council is not listening to its residents. I have lived in Send Marsh all my life and year on year the area is being reduced to a housing estate, each new proposed house will include a minimum of 2 vehicles equating to at least 920 additional cars on the roads increasing pollution and congestion on roads that cannot currently cope especially during the rush hour.

You need to completely change the current road structure, add additional schooling and surgeries before you contemplate building more houses as required by law.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2179</th>
<th>Respondent: 10867105 / Steve Loosley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

- **It was deleted from the 2014 draft** because of all the objections made previously
- The word **minimum** is a change from the previous **maximum** in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development **in the middle of the Green Belt** when Slyfield and Guildford still have **empty** sites and industrial units
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a **reduction** in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a **huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt**
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
- It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4508</th>
<th>Respondent: 10867585 / Hugh Shanks</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
congested and the increase in HGV traffic will only cause further problems. I also object to the infilling of areas between villages via the use of Green Belt land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1883  Respondent: 10869025 / E.J. Bartlett  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
- It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/611  Respondent: 10869345 / Richard Vickery  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A58

I object to the changed proposal for a minimum 7000 square m of floor space instead of the original 2016 plan for a maximum amount of spaces, thus allowing for further development in the future. This development is quite unnecessary in the middle of a green belt area especially as nearby Slyfield industrial estate is not fully utilised.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/448  Respondent: 10869921 / Kate Haskins  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Burnt Common, London Road (Policy A58)
- This was deleted from the 2014 draft, why is it back again? It would be a pleasant surprise if the deletion of a proposal on the grounds of local objections could be proof that someone somewhere in the planning department is listening to local voices.

- A change of wording from “maximum” to “minimum” shows another expansion of the plan. Supply currently outstrips demand for industrial units in current industrial areas such as Slyfield, so there is no justification to destroy green belt land to create more supply.

- The impact on local roads, already over congested, will once again, be negative.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3345  **Respondent:** 10869985 / Alan Blackburn  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This is an industrial development in the middle of a green belt. Again traffic gridlock will ensue! I find the whole plan unbelievable.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3569  **Respondent:** 10870593 / Maureen Blackburn  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58

This is an industrial development in the middle of a green belt. Again traffic gridlock will ensue! I find the whole plan unbelievable.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** pslp172/219  **Respondent:** 10871329 / Lyn Gargan  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Burnt Common Plans London Road Policy A58
I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

This had been deleted from the 2014 draft due to the strong objections put forward. But now it is back in the plan and the word minimum instead of maximum has been used. Why has the wording changed?

With empty buildings and sites available on the Slyfield and other industrial areas in Guildford it is not necessary to provide a minimum allocation of 7,000 sq m of industrial or warehousing buildings on this site.

Stated in the 2017 Employment Land Needs Assessment there is evidence of reduced demand to 3.9 hectares for the whole borough and not the need for the larger allocation of over 10 Hectares in the Send Green Belt.

There is a need to understand why the council is going for the maximum projected use on all counts.

The impact on the narrow roads and the surrounding access roads will be huge. Industrial vehicles needing to use this for accessing the proposed sites will exacerbate the accidents and fatalities from the exit off the A3 Burnt Common road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/539</th>
<th>Respondent: 10871329 / Lyn Gargan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

- This had been deleted from the 2014 draft due to the strong objections put forward. But now it is back in the plan and the word minimum instead of maximum has been used. Why has the wording changed?

- With empty buildings and sites available on the Slyfield and other industrial areas in Guildford it is not necessary to provide a minimum allocation of 7,000 sq m of industrial or warehousing buildings on this site.

- Stated in the 2017 Employment Land Needs Assessment there is evidence of reduced demand to 3.9 hectares for the whole borough and not the need for the larger allocation of over 10 Hectares in the Send Green Belt.

- There is a need to understand why the council is going for the **maximum projected use on all counts**.

- The impact on the narrow roads and the surrounding access roads will be huge. Industrial vehicles needing to use this for accessing the proposed sites will exacerbate the accidents and fatalities from the exit off the A3 Burnt Common road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3888</th>
<th>Respondent: 10873313 / Rob Stevens</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object in the strongest possible way to Policy A58 change at Burnt Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft due to multiple previous objections
- The work minimum is a change from the previous maximum in the 2016 plan. Since then there has been a decline in the demand for industrial land.
- Slyfield/Guildford has vacant sites to accommodate industrial / warehouse demand.
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand so no need to develop Burnt Common site.
- The proposed industrial / warehouse development will impact the Green Belt of the villages Send / Ripley. It will change the character of the villages and not preserve the heritage and Green Belt of this area.
- The proposed industrial / warehouse development will impact local traffic. The roads around the Shell garage roundabout are already severely congested and this development will impact this even further. The U-turn on London Road near the proposed site is already dangerous, accidents have occurred as the traffic coming from the A3 onto the London Road is travelling at minimum 50 mph. The proposed industrial / warehouse development will increase traffic on this junction.
- The proposed industrial / warehouse development will impact noise in the area. Noise is already an issue being so close to the A3 and the London Road / A 247 itself are noisy with traffic. Lorries parked on the London Road are already contributing to this noise day & night.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3055  Respondent: 10881217 / Ben Stevens  Agent:  

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common. Why is an industrial development required when there are empty sites and industrial units, at Slyfield and in Guildford?
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4694  **Respondent:** 10884545 / Sarah O'Hagan  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.
15. 1. I object to the potential impact of para 4.4.23a on Burnt Common with its over allocation of industrial zoning is subterfuge for a waste management facility which is a dishonest and underhand approach to planning and proper consultation.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4712  Respondent: 10884993 / Dave Fassom  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floor space and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
C.iii. Policy A58 Burnt Common – My Objections

1. I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site.

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

15. I object to the potential impact of para 4.4.23a on Burnt Common with its over allocation of industrial zoning is subterfuge for a waste management facility which is a dishonest and underhand approach to planning and proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**Comment ID:** pslp172/1019  **Respondent:** 10892097 / Steve Whatley  **Agent:**  

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a decline in the need for industrial areas of this type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slyfield &amp; Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The increase in commercial traffic will cause major congestion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**  
**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2379  **Respondent:** 10892513 / C.R. Sewter  **Agent:**  

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A58 pages 257-8 at Burnt Common Warehouse, London Road because:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The word &quot;minimum&quot; is changed from the previous &quot;maximum&quot; in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the GREEN BELT when Slyfield and Guildford still have EMPTY sites and industrial units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land FOR THE WHOLE BOROUGH not a massive allocation of 10 HECTURES IN THE GREEN BELT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The impact of extra traffic that would be generated would cause gridlock on the local roads.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ABIDE BY THE ALREADY AGREED POLICY A58 DECISION THAT IT SHOULD BE THROW OUT.**  

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**  
**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2379  **Respondent:** 10897633 / A Aldridge  **Agent:**  

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land at Burnt Common, London Road - Policy A58 I object to this proposal for a new allocation of a minimum of 7000 sq m of industrial or warehousing for the following reasons:-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no demand for additional industrial and warehouse development in here are still vacant units at Slyfu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
Land at Burnt Common, London Road - Policy A58 I object to this proposal for a new allocation of a minimum of 7000 sq m of industrial or warehousing for the following reasons:- There is no demand for additional industrial and warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when there are still vacant units at Slyfield and Guildford.

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because -
- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the previous objections
- It is a residential area and not suitable for industrial development. There are empty sites and industrial units in Guildford and Slyfield. Slyfield is where it should be sited and not in green belt
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green belt
- The roads in this area are unsuitable for the traffic this development will generate.

The change in wording to minimum from maximum implies plans for even more industrial development.

There is no need for industrial development on this scale, nor in the Green Belt. There are other more suitable sites such as Slyfield which are not being used to capacity. It would seem that demand is diminishing not increasing.

Again, the increased traffic would make life for the existing residential population intolerable. The roads barely cope with the current level of traffic and are frequently gridlocked by road works, road closures for repairs such as the bridges being and other traffic problems in the vicinity including the frequent problems on the M25.
Comment ID: pslp172/3518  Respondent: 10899137 / Justina Buswell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A58 at Burnt Common, London Road - which was deleted from the 2014 draft plan because of objections made previously. It is totally unnecessary and inappropriate to build industrial units on Green Belt land in a village of this size. There are already suitable and available sites within Slyfield and Guildford. Again any increased movements of industrial vehicles on the surrounding roads will lead to total gridlock.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3568  Respondent: 10903265 / M Stokes  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There is now a new allocation for a minimum of 7000 sq.m of industrial or warehousing:- This was deleted from the original plan but has now found its way back in and the wording has changed to a minimum from the previous wording to maximum. We already have industrial units in Tannery Lane, which stand empty.

The office block on the A247 in the village couldn’t be let and was refurbished into flats and now sold. Slyfield and Guildford have many empty industrial units and empty sites available. I cannot see why it is necessary to build a large industrial site in a village location in a Green Belt area.

When the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand for the whole borough. Yet you plan a huge allocation in Send in the Green Belt. Why?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1151  Respondent: 10904833 / Elaine Roberts-Toomey  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A58 Burnt Common because you have included the wording 'minimum' guess you hoped we would not notice, the extra local traffic would make exiting the A3 unsafe and not somewhere your would want to base a business, there is actually no demand for new industrial land as plenty is available at Slyfields which has better access. Again this is in the middle of greenbelt, you are ignoring thousands of previous objections from 2014.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: pslp172/5418  Respondent: 10906145 / Joe Gervasio  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2445  Respondent: 10910753 / Heather Thompson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3502  Respondent: 10912513 / Sarah Green  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to changes relating to Policy A58 Burnt Common because
- This Policy was deleted from the 2014 Plan following previous objections.
- Additionally i see the Plan now references ‘ Minimum’ rather than the original ‘ Maximum’ referring to the 7,000 sq feet of industrial or warehousing. If the original proposal was deleted again i see no reason why the changed plan actually increases the proposed level of development.
- The impact on the Clandon Road and adjoining roads will create huge traffic issues, and noise and light pollution issues.
- There is no need to develop on this section of Green Belt land when other local sites including Slyfield and Guildford have empty existing sites and ‘brown field’ sites amiable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: pslp172/4354  Respondent: 10912513 / Sarah Green  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to changes relating to Policy A58 Burnt Common because

- This Policy was deleted from the 2014 Plan following previous objections.
- Additionally i see the Plan now references 'Minimum' rather than the original ‘Maximum’ referring to the 7,000 sq feet of industrial or warehousing. If the original proposal was deleted again i see no reason why the changed plan actually increases the proposed level of development.
- The impact on the Clandon Road and adjoining roads will create huge traffic issues, and noise and light pollution issues.
- There is no need to develop on this section of Green Belt land when other local sites including Slyfield and Guildford have empty existing sites and ‘brown field’ sites amiable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4133  Respondent: 10918273 / Katharine Moss  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a minimum of 7,000 of industrial or warehousing.
This was removed from the 2014 draft because of previous objections.

It previously stated 'Maximum' now says 'Minimum' and there has been an reduction in demand for industrial land.

This is Green belt Land and both Slyfield and Guildford have empty units, therefore there is no requirement.

The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the in the Green Belt

The impact on small surrounding roads will increase the gridlock we experience.

Existing Villages will be joined up.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2795  Respondent: 10919841 / J.A. Millard  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to Policy A53, Burnt Common, London Road. This was deleted from the Local Plan 2014 draft because of all the local communities’ objections and should not be resuscitated. Guildford Borough Council have not provided exceptional circumstances for building on this Green Belt Land and there are better alternatives at Slyfield Industrial Estate and other locations in Guildford where relevant infrastructure already exists. This policy change contradicts the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment which shows a reduction in demand for industrial land for the whole borough. The implementation of 7,000 square metres of industrial and/or warehousing will bring gridlock to the local roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2920  Respondent: 10920961 / Mark Stevens  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common. An industrial development here is not required when there are empty sites and industrial units at Slyfield and in Guildford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2291  Respondent: 10921633 / Emma Loosley  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:

• It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
• The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land
• There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
• The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt
• The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
• It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2868  Respondent: 10922017 / Arthur Thomas  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

- It ignores previous objections raised by local people.
- It is in permanent Green Belt and no ‘Exceptional Circumstances’ exist.
- It will cause overdevelopment of the villages of Ripley and Send and the number of homes is excessive.
- It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the Key purpose of Green Belt.
- It will create excessive traffic that will block up the local roads.
- The infrastructure of schools, medical facilities, roads, etc have difficulty coping with the present level of population without having the further burden of additional homes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3806  Respondent: 10924641 / Ben Yates  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously.
- The word ‘minimum’ is a change from the previous ‘maximum’ in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land.
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
- It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2620  Respondent: 10925409 / Tina Higgins  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
- The word "minimum" is a change from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
- It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt
Comment ID: pslp172/2928  Respondent: 10927553 / Marion Harris  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I also OBJECT to POLICY A58, the land at London Road, Burntcommon, where it is now proposed to use the whole triangle of Green Belt land between the A3, Clandon Road, A247, and the old dead leg of the former dual carriageway that used to be the A3 before the Ripley By-Pass was opened 41 years ago. This new proposal will now take up 10 hectares, rather than the relatively small area previously allocated, and will vastly increase traffic flows and problems in the Burntcommon area, which are already very bad, especially at peak hours. The additional industrial traffic generated by these proposals will make the problems even worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3198  Respondent: 10932577 / Oscar Green  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to changes relating to Policy A58 Burnt Common because

- This Policy was deleted from the 2014 Plan following previous objections.
- Additionally i see the Plan now references ‘Minimum’ rather than the original ‘‘Maximum’ referring to the 7,000 sq feet of industrial or warehousing. If the original proposal was deleted again i see no reason why the changed plan actually increases the proposed level of development.
- The impact on the Clandon Road and adjoining roads will create huge traffic issues, and noise and light pollution issues.
- There is no need to develop on this section of Green Belt land when other local sites including Slyfield and Guildford have empty existing sites and "brown field” sites amiable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1189  Respondent: 10934689 / Adam Fox  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- This Policy was deleted from the 2014 Plan following previous objections.
- Additionally i see the Plan now references ‘Minimum’ rather than the original ‘‘Maximum’ referring to the 7,000 sq feet of industrial or warehousing. If the original proposal was deleted again i see no reason why the changed plan actually increases the proposed level of development.
- The impact on the Clandon Road and adjoining roads will create huge traffic issues, and noise and light pollution issues.
- There is no need to develop on this section of Green Belt land when other local sites including Slyfield and Guildford have empty existing sites and "brown field” sites amiable.
I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
- The word "minimum" is a change from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
- It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
- This Policy was deleted from the 2014 Plan following previous objections.

- Additionally, I see the Plan now references ‘Minimum’ rather than the original ‘Maximum’ referring to the 7,000 sq feet of industrial or warehousing. If the original proposal was deleted again, I see no reason why the changed plan actually increases the proposed level of development.

- There is no need to develop on this section of Green Belt land when other local sites including Slyfield and Guildford have empty existing sites and ‘brown field’ sites amiable.

- The impact on the Clandon Road and adjoining roads will create huge traffic issues, and noise and light pollution issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/443</th>
<th>Respondent: 10942017 / Jason Fenwick</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objection 2: Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A58**

I object to the plan for Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Send, Policy A58. The new change states that there will now be minimum development rather than a maximum development of industrial/warehousing on this land. Has anyone actually considered the potential for queuing traffic on that A3 junction? Has anyone considered the extra heavy freight using the A247 into Woking or through Ripley? Has the need for such development been properly assessed? This development is not required at all, let alone a change in the plan to say it may be developed to a larger size than initially proposed. They are plenty of empty industrial/warehousing sites in and around the Guildford/Woking area, Slyfield, Sheerwater etc. This will bring nothing but misery to the local population and I think will detrimentally ruin the area affecting house prices and people will leave the area.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2906</th>
<th>Respondent: 10944065 / Freya and John Risdon</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I also object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:
- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously.
- The word 'minimum' is a change from the previous 'maximum' in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land.
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty site and industrial units.
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 ha. for industrial land for the whole borough, not a huge over-allocation of 10 ha. at Send in the Green Belt.
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
- It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
C.iii. Policy A58 Burnt Common – My Objections

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site.

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.
I object to the potential impact of para 4.4.23a on Burnt Common with its over allocation of industrial zoning is subterfuge for a waste management facility which is a dishonest and underhand approach to planning and proper consultation.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/531  **Respondent:** 10945793 / JN Boardman  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

This Local Plan does not come close to meaning of the word "Plan," in fact it's main thrust reflects the gloss of political short-termism!

Even before "The Plan," is considered, the current and existing issues need to be resolved.

Road infrastructures:
- Currently, there is not one feeder road onto or away from the A3, which does not have a bottle neck.
- Many with these issues are within a couple of miles from the A50 proposal.
- Most of these roads are just historic lanes; having been tweaked & tarmac covered.
- Where are the planned improvements & changes for these side roads?
- Under the A58 multi directional traffic flow; it must be proven that both, getting onto or off the A3 will be affective & efferent over time. Not just a quick fix.

Environment Footprint:
- Increases in house building, Warehouses etc .. along with all infrastructural changes; all will dramatically impact on the environmental foot print.
- This will not just happen locally around the Send Area but, also be long & lasting.
- There is nothing in "The Plan," that addresses this issue.
- There must be a better way & a better plan.

Ecology Damage:
- Most of the land, nominated under "The Plan," is currently green belt country side; nothing seems to have been put down for what needs to be protected the ecology & how this must be done.

Pollutants:
- Air pollution, Noise & Lighting are impacts that must be understood and addressed as current & increasing problems
- Until such time as these are fully understood & resolved, with solutions in place, politically, environmentally & technically; no planning approval should be given.

I object to; tweaks in the local highways infrastructure; which will not match the vast increases in motorised transport due to this "Massive Proposed Development."

I totally object to The Local Plan, Strategy and Sites June 2017 because, it does away with the "Green Belt." It tramples over most, if not all of the local electorates wishes.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site.

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357 sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607 sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750 sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357 sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357 sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3091</th>
<th>Respondent: 10949601 / Victoria Parker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1298</th>
<th>Respondent: 10949729 / Ivan Szabo-Toth</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I object to Policy A58 Land at Burnt Common, London Road because there is no need to build industrial or warehouse developments in the green belt where other brown field sites are available in Guildford and Slyfield. Overall in my opinion the council needs to have more respect for green belt and focus on brown belt sites. Also in Send the existing traffic levels are already at breaking point.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/6</th>
<th>Respondent: 10949921 / Jan Parker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The potential for a substantial increase in industrial floorspace from 7000 sq m to an unspecified amount at the site A58 Burnt Common does not provide local residents with enough information for a full and proper consultation given the ambiguity and lack of detail within the document</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a and does not allow for full and proper consultation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1833</th>
<th>Respondent: 10949921 / Jan Parker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch)

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

1. The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, … (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]”
2. The site [A43] provides the employment floor space needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

I object to removal

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2822  Respondent: 10951489 / Lorna M Cave  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 for a new allocation of 7,000 sq. metres of industrial or warehousing – the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand not an increase! At Slyfield there are empty spaces and industrial sites which lends itself much more to this sort of development than in Send in the middle of Green Belt – it is totally unsuitable. WHY in a village like Send?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3508  Respondent: 10952161 / Alison Humberstone  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to this (previously removed) item being brought back. You have now even made it bigger and more impacting than even before, despite the huge volume of objections which led it to be removed previously. It was "maximum of" when you had so many objections it was removed, now its been brought back as a minimum of 7000 sq m of warehousing! This shows utter disregard for the unnecessary damage to the green belt (which I believed was protected but which the GBC seem to feel is just protected in the past to make it available for them to squander now and future generations will simply be deprived of if GBC don't step up and take a better/correct stance and protect it). Why is this even on here? This smack of adding in something to concede in negotiations. This is not needed, was removed before, no new need has occurred yet you bring it back even worse than before so you can drop it but push on with the other items.

---
This is not a game! The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows less of this type of property is needed, Slyfield has land and vacant buildings and yet you bring this back? Stop causing upset and concern for Send and surrounding villages and accept that this is not needed, impacts the locals and the environment/green belt. Drop it now.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A58. Now a new allocation for a minimum of 7,000 sq m of industrial or warehousing

I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:
- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
- The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan
- and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the
- Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10
- hectares at Send in the Green Belt
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
- It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potentially newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.423a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1414  Respondent: 10956161 / Pauline McCallister  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.
C.iii. Policy A58 Burnt Common – My Objections

I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site

This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha.

There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.“

There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

I object to the potential impact of para 4.4.23a on Burnt Common with its over allocation of industrial zoning is subterfuge for a waste management facility which is a dishonest and underhand approach to planning and proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2749  Respondent: 10957313 / R Holmes  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) is Sound? ( ) is Legally Compliant? ( )

Should this proposed use be allocated: No

- Proposed site is green belt. All green belt land must be protected.
- Significant adverse affect on quality of life for existing local residents and the character of the locality.
- Local infrastructure is totally inadequate.
- Access road network not adequate: the traffic along the A3 is at a standstill at some point weekdays between Burpham and the A31 Hogsback Junction and northbound towards the M25 at Junction 10. If there is a problem on the A3 northbound towards the M25, motorists try to beat part of the traffic jam by taking advantage of the B2215 London Road slip road to continue via Burnt Common and Ripley and Filter back onto the A3 near Wisley. Obviously this causes even more queues on the M25, again the local roads become more congested than normal.
- Local link road network would not cope with the added number of cars, let alone vans and lorries. There are queues at peak times on the A247 at the old Woking Roundabout, the Burnt Common Roundabout and the B2215 through Ripley.
- The new sliproads, which have been proposed in the Local Plan – 2017, to/from the A3 at Send Marsh/Burnt Common may alleviate some of the traffic going through Ripley to/from the A4 but it will not solve Send’s traffic problems. Creating new slip roads here will just have the effect of pushing more traffic through Send, Send Marsh and Burnt Common.
- Foot of A3 slip road to London Road still prone to flooding.
- Vehicles exiting Woodhill at the London Road junction have to be extremely careful as they must contend with vehicles travelling fast off the A3. They have limited views as the A3 is at a slightly higher level than Woodhill so cars can only be seen once they are on the short slope of the slip road.
- Much more pollution for the area – noise, light, air.
- Site near special protection area.
- Public transport links for employees are not good if coming to/from the Woking direction. The only bus service is the 426/463 via Send and Send Marsh. There are no arrivals at Burnt Common between 0756hrs and 0925hrs. (The 0925hrs service also deviates down to Ripley before turning round to go back up to Burnt Common – which would cost more). On the return journey back towards Woking, there are no departures from Burnt Common between 1537hrs and 1742hrs (the 1742hrs also does the loop down to Ripley before coming back up
to go back to Woking through Send). This bus service does not run Sundays or Public Holidays. Under the ‘Local Plan 2017 – infrastructure – BT Bus Transport’ there doesn’t appear to be any proposed improvements listen for this bus route.

- The cycling network is not adequate. It will be even worse if more cars, vans and lorries come into the area. If the council really mean to encourage more cyclists, then cycle lanes need to be provided each side of the road and be separated from the roads (perhaps by way of kerb edging). Putting dotted lines on the roads does not work. It does not encourage new users and is not safe.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1563  **Respondent:** 10957441 / Christopher Hunter  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

As a resident of Burnt Common for twelve years, I would like to strongly object to the above proposals.

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because it was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections previously made. There has been a decline in demand for industrial land and it is totally wrong to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of this precious Green Belt. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4432  **Respondent:** 10962657 / Amanda Leader  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4451  Respondent: 10962689 / Martin Ladd  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.4.23a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/4519</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>10967649 / Ian Cornwall</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2529  Respondent: 10969985 / Guy Middleton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A58 change at Burnt Common, London Road because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
- The word ‘minimum’ is a change from the previous ‘maximum’ in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in the demand for industrial land
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse developments in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
- It will join up the existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4385  Respondent: 10970497 / Michael Cook  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for
an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1878  Respondent: 10970817 / Lee Crane  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because it was previously removed from the 2014 draft due to the amount of objections made. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2888  Respondent: 10972385 / M.E. Firingstein  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the latest changes to plans for the above villages.

1. GARLICK’S ARCH (POLICY A43) KILN LANE SENDMARSH.
2. CLOCKBARN NURSERY IN TANNERY LANE, SEND (POLICY A422)
3. BURNT COMMON – PROPOSED SITE FOR MIN: 7000sq.m. INDUSTRIAL SPACE (POLICY A58)
Whatever happened to ‘GReen’? our green belt up to now has been jealously guarded. Your intentions to urbanise our villages beggars belief!

The roads around this area are choked with traffic jams every whichway.

What about the need for schools, medical facilities, sewage drainage-plants: and returning to problem of extra traffic many families have 2 or 3 cars per household. and extra POLICE STATIONS? needed?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/278  **Respondent:** 10972833 / Robin L. Smith  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**Policy A58 - London Road/Burnt Common**

- Was removed from the 2014 plan due to the myriad of objection
- Crucial change was from "Maximum" to "Minimum" leaving an open ended excuse for any amount of such industrial space
- Industrial space is not required as there is a decline in the demand of any such space with plenty "For rent" signs all over the place for such space
- Such a development will be bang in the middle of the green belt whilst Guildford and Slyfield still have vacant sites of various kinds including industrial
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough - **not the huge allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt being proposed!!!**
- The already heavy traffic upon the small surrounding roads will cause gridlock
- Cause the distinctive separation of the different villages to disappear and defeat the purpose of Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4448  **Respondent:** 10986689 / Richard Harris  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is
double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4730  Respondent: 10990145 / Anne Lee  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4583  Respondent: 10992225 / Emma Ringshaw  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site.
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

15. I object to the potential impact of para 4.4.23a on Burnt Common with its over allocation of industrial zoning is subterfuge for a waste management facility which is a dishonest and underhand approach to planning and proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1679  Respondent: 10992801 / Martine Szabo-toth  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 Land at Burnt Common, London Road because there is no need to build industrial or warehouse developments in the green belt where other brown field sites are available in Guildford and Slyfield. The impact on roads in the immediate area will cause excessive traffic problems.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2171  Respondent: 10995233 / Pam Harnor  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
- The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
- It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2053  Respondent: 10995297 / Peter Cormack  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Burnt Common strategic industrial employment site for light industry, storage and distribution activities. It is to be designated an Industrial Strategic Employment Site which means that it is a preferred site for industrial development including waste management facilities. The site is 9ha which it is stated allows for considerable future expansion. This will generate large amounts of traffic including heavy vehicles on the A247.
1. I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I am unable to understand your desire to build Industrial and warehousing units on Green Belt land whilst empty units exist in both Guildford and at Slyfield.

The congestion that a development on this scale will create in this area is unimaginable, not only the employees on such a site having to drive to work as inadequate public transport exists, but the mayhem that will be created by large commercial vehicles trying to navigate the local “Country Roads” to gain access to the site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp172/3951  Respondent: 11006241 / Sally Harrison  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

My third objection is to Policy A58. This development was removed from the 2014 draft because of objections which are still relevant. The proposed site is vast at 10 hectares and to be on Green Belt land. I understand that the demand for such industrial and warehouse development has decreased. So why is an increase apposite here? Also it is not satisfactory to use the word *minimum* instead of maximum as this opens the way for yet further development: Would it not make more sense to use sites already designated for such purpose such as at Slyfield?

Yet again the impact of increased traffic, and in this case heavy traffic, is a major concern for the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/671  Respondent: 11008033 / Sandra Reeves  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because it had been deleted from the 2014 draft plan because of all the objections previously made. In particular I object to the word "minimum" changing from the previous word "maximum" particularly since then there has been a decline in the demand for industrial land. There is no proven need for local industrial or warehouse development on Green Belt land when both Slyfield and Guildford have empty sites and industrial units. The impact that such a development would have on the village is substantial and would create traffic gridlock, as well as joining up the existing villages and defeating the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2369  Respondent: 11009825 / Sally Baker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**BURNT COMMON POLICY A58**

Warehouse development in the middle of a Green Belt area is quite inappropriate when there is room available for rent at Slyfield. The traffic would cause havoc to the minor surrounding roads. I object to this proposal.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/308  Respondent: 11010145 / Julian Ottaway  Agent:

---
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A58

Industry requirements for this area are negligible. Introducing heavy goods vehicles and associated employees to this site will exacerbate an already over burdened infrastructure

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4562</th>
<th>Respondent: 11010401 / J M Bates</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2261  Respondent: 11011713 / Mary Warren  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A58. I object to the increased development of Burntcommon which is now expected to provide a minimum of 7000sq.m of employment floor space and not a maximum. There are empty sites and industrial units at Slyfield and in Guildford which could be used before taking away Green Belt land. Send, Ripley and West Clandon will be come a vast semi-industrialised suburb of Guildford similar to the urban sprawl of Croydon.

Already the roads around Burntcommon are inadequate for the amount of heavy traffic which uses them. The A247 through Send and West Clandon is narrow and in places cannot accommodate 2 lorries side by side, leading to holdups with diesel fumes being pumped into the air while the lorries wait. Extra heavy goods vehicle would make the situation intolerable for the ordinary motorist and for the residents of both villages.

The road passes 2 schools which are situated on the road with the playgrounds not far removed from the traffic. In light of the current evidence of the damage done to children's lungs by exposure to diesel fumes, it seems rather self defeating to increase the traffic on these roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2314  Respondent: 11011713 / Mary Warren  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A58. I object to the increased development of Burntcommon which is now expected to provide a minimum of 7000sq.m of employment floor space and not a maximum. There are empty sites and industrial units at Slyfield and in Guildford which could be used before taking away Green Belt land. Send, Ripley and West Clandon will be come a vast semi-industrialised suburb of Guildford similar to the urban sprawl of Croydon.

Already the roads around Burntcommon are inadequate for the amount of heavy traffic which uses them. The A247 through Send and West Clandon is narrow and in places cannot accommodate 2 lorries side by side, leading to holdups with diesel fumes being pumped into the air while the lorries wait. Extra heavy goods vehicle would make the situation intolerable for the ordinary motorist and for the residents of both villages.

The road passes 2 schools which are situated on the road with the playgrounds not far removed from the traffic. In light of the current evidence of the damage done to children's lungs by exposure to diesel fumes, it seems rather self defeating to increase the traffic on these roads.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3318  Respondent: 11011745 / Daniel Hill   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Given that there are still empty industrial sites in Slyfield and Guildford, I do not think that this site should be developed – particularly when it is in the middle of the Green Belt. This development would also have a huge impact on the smaller and already overly congested roads in the Send and Ripley area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/837  Respondent: 11016001 / Brenda Tulloch   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A58 – Land at Burnt Common

I object to the above policy because there is no need to build industrial developments in the middle of Green Belt when there are plenty of empty sites at Slyfield and other Guildford locations.

The extra traffic will cause gridlock to an already busy road system.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2603  Respondent: 11023489 / Trevor Pound   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Burnt Common, London Road (policy A58):

This potential ribbon development along the A3 will clog up already busy local roads and I thought had previously been rejected as a site for development. I am unsure why it is now being reconsidered.

I can only assume reference to “minimum” development is an error? Surely any planning proposal should cap development by quoting a maximum!
I am unconvinced that we need additional commercial space over and above that which would be available through the
better utilisation and managing of existing brown field sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4568</th>
<th>Respondent: 11023585 / Jean Walker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site |
| 2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously. |
| 3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt. |
| 4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.” |
| 5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units. |
| 6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt. |
| 7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.” |
| 8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common. |
| 9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm. |
| 10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock. |
| 11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt. |
| 12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common. |
| 13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space. |
| 14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate. |
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2172  Respondent: 11024225 / Julian Harnor  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:

• It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
• The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land
• There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
• The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt
• The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
• It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1388  Respondent: 11024385 / Alison and Peter Parrott  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a58 because the industrial sites that are available in the Guildford area are not being used.

Also the extra traffic would cause major problems around Send

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4247  Respondent: 11028481 / Emma Rowland  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A58.

Now a new allocation for a minimum of 7,000 sq m of industrial or warehousing
I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously.
- The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land.
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
- It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3588  Respondent: 11031713 / Stephen Barter  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because it was deleted from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously. Furthermore the word “minimum” referring to the 7000sq m of industrial and warehousing is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan despite the fact that since that plan there has been a decline in the demand for industrial land. Also, with empty sites and units at Slyfield and Guildford what reason can there be to put another development in the middle of Green Belt? Once again, such a development will further exacerbate the traffic congestion problems in the Ripley and Send areas.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/689  Respondent: 11031937 / Patrick Ollington  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The potential for a substantial increase in industrial floorspace from 7,000sq m to an unspecified amount at the site A58 Burnt Common does not provide local residents with enough information for a full and proper consultation given the ambiguity and lack of detail within the document.

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, tucked away in policy 4.4.23a and does not allow for full and proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/441  Respondent: 11032705 / Mike Tarrant  Agent:
**Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58**

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I object Policy A58: Burnt Common. Warehousing and Industrial units.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because, of the change of wording from up to 7,000sq m. to minimum of 7,000sq m. The use of the word ‘minimum’ opens up the site for unlimited development. Which is not required. Employment Lands Needs Assessment (ELNA) 2015 shows an 80% reduction from the previous ELNA carried out by GBC in 2013 for employment space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because, heavy traffic would be attracted from the M25, A3 and the A247, which is not suitable for commercial traffic!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object because Industrial and Warehousing sites and units are still empty at Slyfield and Guildford. So surely expanding existing Brown field industrial areas is better than creating a new one on Green Belt Land!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I question why the Cassidy Slyfield Ltd. North Slyfield site, allocated in 2014 By Guildford Council for Industrial and Warehouse use, was withdrawn from the Local Plan?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID: pslp172/4435  Respondent: 11032801 / Louise Springfield  Agent:**

**Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58**

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

| 1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site |
| 2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously. |
| 3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt. |
| 4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.” |
| 5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units. |
| 6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt. |
| 7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.” |
| 8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately |
half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3848  Respondent: 11033057 / Jo Komisarczuk  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A58 land at Burnt Common, London Road. I can think of no sensible reason to build warehouses in the middle of the greenbelt, and to change the word maximum to minimum, since the plan in 2016 is ridiculous. This change of wording has come with the removal from the Garlick’s Arch back to the original placement in A58. It is well known that there is a reduction in warehouse use currently nationally and that there are empty sites and warehouses that have already been built in Slyfield and Guildford, so why suddenly build even more that are not needed? There is no reason to take Green belt land for such a project especially as there are clearly no exceptional circumstances to require such a change in use. Building on this section of Green Belt will also cause even more congestion on the roads and lanes in the area, which were never built to be more than country roads and lanes, and no prevision has been made for improvement in infrastructure. There is a note that a waste management facility could be added at A58, but this addition will not allow for any discussion. Such sites are highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency, which is being completely ignored at best by the addition of a waste management facility.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/629  Respondent: 11033985 / John Peachey  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58. Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Send

Changed from ‘maximum’ 7000 sq m to ‘minimum’ 7000 sq m of industrial or warehousing. This is not justified as there has been a decline in requirement for industrial land.
There is no need to build industrial/warehouse development on Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites.

The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares of industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

The vans and heavy goods vehicles will create traffic gridlock in the villages of Send and Ripley.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

*Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2915  **Respondent:** 11035809 / Trevor Osborn  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 Land at Burnt Common allocation for a minimum of 7,000 square meters of industrial warehousing. This will increase traffic and pollution on the A247.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

*Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/692  **Respondent:** 11036321 / Vinciane Ollington  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The potential for a substantial increase in industrial floorspace from 7,000 sqm to an unspecified amount at the site A58 Burnt Common does not provide local residents with enough information for a full and proper consultation given the ambiguity and lack of detail within the document.

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, tucked away in policy 4.4.23a and does not allow for full and proper consultation.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

*Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1253  **Respondent:** 11036705 / Brian Slade  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 change - Land at Burnt Common, London Road which was deleted from the 2014 draft due to all the objections because there is no proven demand now or in the future for additional industrial capacity. It would
therefore appear that GBC is presuming that a new A3 junction will be built sometime in the future at Send and justify this excessive industrial development within a Green Belt residential/rural area.

Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units and the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for the whole of Guildford Borough - not the excessive allocation of 10 hectares in Send alone within the Green Belt which will cause major traffic gridlock in the surrounding roads and join up existing villages - again defeating the Green Belt. It is also noted that the word "maximum" in the 2016 Plan has, very significantly, been changed to "minimum".

Existing roads necessary to service such a development do not have anywhere near the capacity to accommodate such a demand. This is totally unacceptable and smacks of an attempt at sleight of hand and dishonesty by GBC to confuse residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3228  Respondent: 11036801 / Judith Mercer  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

10. Policy A58 Burnt Common
I object to Policy A58 Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment site for reasons below:
- The previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft local plan due to all the objections made previously
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
- There is no justification for building anymore industrial development in the borough
- The 2017 Employment Land Needs Assessment (ELNA) shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the entire borough, not a huge allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt
- It will be contrary to national policy protecting Green Belt by joining up existing villages
- Surrounding roads will be seriously impacted causing severe congestion or gridlock
- I am informed that the Aecom research in the ELNA 2017 is of poor quality and lacks sufficient analysis and does not support industrial development in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
- The mention of possible inclusion of waste management facility at para 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation, is inappropriate and I object to this being included
- There is an over allocation of industrial zoning at Burnt Common at para 4.4.23a which hides the possible development of a waste management facility. This is dishonest and deceitful and does not amount to proper planning or consultation. In view of the above I am of the opinion that Policy A58 is also misguided by substandard reports and wrong analysis. It ignores the constraints posed by the Green Belt. Therefore I object to this amended policy. There is no justification for such a development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/736  Respondent: 11036993 / Natalie Ollington  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The potential for a substantial increase in industrial floorspace from 7,000 sqm to an unspecified amount at the site A58 Burnt Common does not provide local residents with enough information for a full and proper consultation given the ambiguity and lack of detail within the document.

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, tucked away in policy 4.4.23a and does not allow for full and proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3290  **Respondent:** 11037313 / Debbie Greener  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
- The word "minimum" is a change from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
- It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1086  **Respondent:** 11039681 / Bruce Jeffreson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch) GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)
The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3851  Respondent: 11040705 / Patricia Cullimore  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Burnt Common, Policy A58 I object to this being used as an industrial site or potential for a Waste Management Facility because there is already sufficient industrial units at Slyfield and Guildford which are empty and there is absolutely no need to build additional units, especially so close to housing.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4374  Respondent: 11041025 / Debra Somner Fraser  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

C.iii. Policy A58 Burnt Common – My Objections

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

15. I object to the potential impact of para 4.4.23a on Burnt Common with its over allocation of industrial zoning is subterfuge for a waste management facility which is a dishonest and underhand approach to planning and proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Policy A58 Burnt Common – Objections

- This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
- The Plan calls for a minimum of 7000 sq. m. (0.7 ha, previously in the 2016 Plan a maximum figure) but the proposal is to take 9.26 hectares out of the Green Belt. There is no proper justification given for taking the additional land.
- The evidence base does not support this scale of additional industrial space and the justification for placing it in the Green Belt is not made out. If the quality of some existing industrial provision is not adequate this should cause re-development of it not a large encroachment into the Green Belt.

The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a demand of 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Burnt Common in the Green Belt.

- The reference to waste management facilities mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and should not be so casually included for this site.
- The proposal for light industry, storage, distribution and waste management activities at Burnt Common will generate large amounts of traffic including heavy vehicles on the A247.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to policy A58 - on the grounds that again it is part of the Green-belt so development is not permitted, and further, that such development is inappropriate when other industrial sites in the Borough have empty space (e.g. Slyfield Industrial Estate) and there is no proven need for further industrial space. I object to the wording 'minimum' replacing 'maximum' of 7000 sq m, which opens up any approved development to unlimited expansion. This is an abuse of the planning process. The residential A247 Send Road is narrow in places, in spite of linking the A3 and M25 to Woking town centre and its mainline station to London, and coach service to Heathrow Airport. It is congested in peak times, carrying heavy vehicle and commuter traffic through the bottle necks of parked cars and the narrow bridge at Broadmeads, which is not wide enough to allow two heavy vehicles to pass over it at the same time. Cyclists commuting into Woking, create further congestion at peak times. Adding to this traffic from hundreds more houses and industrial sites, and traffic from other huge proposed developments at Wisley Airport and nearby Ockham, Clandon and Horsley wards, (policies A35, A37, A38, A39 and A40 - at least 2500 homes) is utterly inappropriate and without evidence of need.

On a daily basis, the A3 from Burpham to the M25 is at a virtual stand-still in both the morning and evening peak times due to the weight of traffic. Any major hold up on the M25 or A3, the traffic can back traffic up as far as the A247 at Broad meads. Adding more commuter and industrial traffic will only exacerbate this, while changing the junction at Burnt Common is unlikely to improve the situation, and could actually add to the problem.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously

• The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 Plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land

• There is no need to build industrial or warehouse developments in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units

• The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 Hectares for industrial land for the whole of the Borough, not a huge allocation of 10 Hectares at Send in the Green Belt

• The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch
GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

- The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm,… (site allocation A25) [than the Burnt Common site did ]”
- The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2153  Respondent: 11043425 / Melinda McLean  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)
The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

10. I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)
This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays.” And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4697  Respondent: 11043553 / Geraldine Banks  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/4529</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>11044129 / Christopher Barrass</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to
build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: pslp172/272  Respondent: 11044161 / Kerry Denholm-Price  Agent:

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. **Policy A58**

I object to the Policy change A58 at Burnt Common with particular reference to the specific point listed below.

1. The proposal for the allocation of industrial of warehousing space at Burnt Common was deleted from the 2014 draft as a result of the level of local objection and the A58 changes fails to demonstrate that the re-instatement is justified.
2. The change in A58 wording from ‘maximum’ to ‘minimum’ allocation of industrial or warehousing space is misaligned with the overall decline in demand for industrial land, as evidenced by the fact that the existing and well established industrial and warehousing sites at Slyfield and Guildford remain under-utilised.

3. The 10 hectares of industrial and warehouse space being proposed for Send in the A58 changes is contraindicated by the reduction in demand for land allocated for this purpose published in the 2017 ‘Employment Land Needs’ assessment which showed only 3.9 hectares worth of demand for the entirety of the Guildford Borough. The A58 changes also represent an unjustifiable over allocation of industrial and warehouse land usage into one single Parish.

4. The local road infrastructure is inadequate to cope with the demand of existing heavy goods traffic and the further development as proposed in the A58 changes will overload the existing road systems to the point of gridlock, increase the traffic hazards that local Schools and GP practices already struggle with and result in increased pollution exposure for the villages of Ripley, Send Marsh and Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/929  Respondent: 11044257 / Corinne Waring  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A58

This development was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the previous objections and the word 'minimum' is a change from the previous 'maximum' in the 20L6 plan. Sincethen, there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. There is no need to build an Industrial or warehouse development in the middle of Green Belt land, when there are empty sites at Slyfield and Guildford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4005  Respondent: 11047329 / Hazel Corstin  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

8. I object to site A58 Burntcommon, which has now become a ‘Strategic Employment Site’. The overall burden on Send (and West Clandon) of the minimum of 7000sq m of industrial space (i.e. could be much larger) is greater than the now deleted up-to 7000 sq m from the neighbouring site A43 Garlick’s Arch. This is a net gain in traffic and congestion in this area. The proposed insetting of Send Business Park from the Green Belt indicates GBC’s increased emphasis and ambition for growth of this village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY A58, LAND AT BURNT COMMON. LONDON ROAD.

I OBJECT to the proposed change to reintroduce industrial/warehousing space, class B1c, B2 and B8 at this location.

1) There is no demonstrated need for warehousing/light industrial space of 7000 square metres here, let alone a MINIMUM development in that figure as is now proposed since this policy was removed from Garlick's Arch, policy A43, where it was in the last draft of the Plan. The demand for light industrial/warehousing land has reduced, and there is absolutely no need for any such development in the Green Belt. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment assessed the need for employment land in the entire borough at 3.9 hectares, yet this site alone would amount to 10 hectares. At Slyfield, Guildford. there is an area of land behind the currently developed light industrial site that was planned for further development of the Slyfield Industrial Estate, and was so included in the original 2014 draft Plan. This is poor quality land between Slyfield and the A3 trunk road. Any need for further warehousing/light industrial land should be met from this land initially. It is clearly wrong to take Green Belt land in Send for such use, and again, there is no demonstrable need to develop in the Green Belt under the "exceptional circumstances" rule. Only about half a mile separates Slyfield from the A3. There is not even a need for the previously mooted "Clay Lane Development". A new junction on the A3 and a short stretch of road into Slyfield from it could alleviate queues at the Stoke junction in Guildford and avoid the need for much of the traffic for Slyfield using that junction and the A320 Woking Road to get to and from the Slyfield Industrial estate.

2) Traffic using the route to and from Burnt Common, especially HGVs, will add to the already over-crowded local roads in the Send and Ripley area. This locality is already regularly grid-locked morning and evening.

3) If this proposal goes ahead it will, along with policy A43, Garlick's Arch, lead to the effective joining of Ripley, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and West Clandon into one conurbation, utterly defeating the purpose of the Green Belt.

4) The Council has shown a lamentable lack of consistency as regards this proposal. It was included in the 2014 draft Plan, at Burnt Common as now, then later removed. In the 2016 draft it was to be at Garlick's Arch, but deleted from it in the current proposed Plan, and has now reverted to site A58, Burnt Common, but this time in an enlarged form. The Council indicates by its actions it really has no idea where this industrial development should take place, or even how large it should be. An indication of the Council's confused thinking as regards this site is provided by its own comments in the 2016 version of the Plan:-

"The site, (A43, Garlick's Arch), affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site at Gosden Hill Farm (policy A25), than the Burnt Common Site, (A58) did. A43 (Garlick's Arch), provides the employment floor space needed in the Plan to help meet identified needs"

A year ago, Guildford Borough Council was trumpeting the merits of Garlick's Arch over Burnt Common to such an extent that it had removed Burnt Common from the Plan entirely. Yet a year on, it has returned Burnt Common to the plan. The Council is ignoring its own guidelines on separation as both policy sites A43 and A58 virtually adjoin each other, being separated only by the A247, Clandon Rd.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously.
- The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land.
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
- It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

I have lived in Send for 13 years and in that time traffic has increased incredibly and I now regularly get stuck coming up Send Barns Lane to Burnt Common and then down to and through Ripley. Getting through Ripley village is hard work with roads that are too narrow already. Local school places are insufficient and getting doctors appointments is getting harder all the time. The amount of expansion these plans would realise is horrendous and I would love for the local councillors to have to live here themselves to see the complete desecration of our beautiful area. We chose to move to a semi rural area, not a town, which is what this village will become. I wrote a long letter of complaint previously, as did many others, and our voices not only have been ignored but the proposals have got even worse subsequently. What are you thinking? PLEASE reconsider.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
become and on and off ramp for the A3 the Send Village will become a carpark not only at rush hour but all through the
day. One can only imagine the quality of life for those living along Send Barns Lane and Send Road. The noise and
pollution from vehicles would be unbearable and no doubt exceed all pollution levels with diesel and petrol fumes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3992  Respondent: 11049729 / Belinda Nicoll  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
- The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has
been a decline in demand for industrial land
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and
Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land
for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
- It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3278  Respondent: 11061345 / Ewbank's Organisation  Agent: DMH Stallard LLP (Geoff
Smith)

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

3. Proposed Amendment – Green Belt Boundary (Policy A58)

3.1 This objection relates to Send Marsh/Burnt Common Amendment No. 2. We propose an amendment to the Green
Belt boundary to include Policy/Site A58 Land around Burnt Common Warehouse, London Road, Send. Our objection is
that this proposed amendment should also exclude the Ewbank’s site from the Green Belt.

3.2 We submit that by not excluding the Ewbank’s site from the Green Belt, this Plan is unsound. It is not ‘positively
prepared’, in that it does not meet objectively assessed development requirements, (in this case, insufficient employment
land), and its retention in the Green Belt is not “justified”, as it could be excluded from the Green Belt, in accordance
with the Borough Council’s own Green Belt and Countryside Studies.

3.3 The Ewbank’s site, together with the Land around Burnt Common Warehouse immediately to the east, was identified
as Site 74 for employment development (B1c, B2 and B8) in the Draft Guildford Borough Local Plan 2014. This
followed the publication of Volume 3 of the Guildford Borough Green Belt and Countryside Study 2013, which was an
‘evidence base’ document for this Draft Plan. It was therefore considered by Guildford Borough to be suitable to be
excluded from the Green Belt at that time, and there have been no changes of circumstances in relation to the Green Belt
since that time. Of particular relevance is that this site was described in the Report to the Council Executive of 11 May 2016 para 4.19 in relation to need for industrial land: “the site is the only suitable and deliverable site identified by the Green Belt and Countryside Study that could meet this need.”

3.4 The Borough Council’s Land Availability Study (February 2016) maintained this view. It proposed that the whole of the land around Burnt Common Warehouse, including the Ewbank’s site, an area of 12.75 hectares, be developed for a mix of uses, with the Ewbank’s site, and land adjacent, being suitable for light industrial (B1c), and/or general industrial (B2), and/or storage and distribution (B8). It also made specific reference to retaining the Ewbank’s Auction Rooms use within this overall site. We maintain that as there has been no change in circumstance in relation to the Green Belt in this location, that this whole site should be excluded from the Green Belt, and allocated for employment purposes.

3.5 Ewbank’s Auction Rooms has an urgent need for additional floor space and wishes to remain on this present site given its location, and wishes to continue their expansion. The business commenced in 1990 turnover has grown since they moved here in 1994 by approximately 6 times and employment has risen from 3 to over 30 in the same time. Ewbank’s are Surrey’s leading antique and fine art auctioneers with a saleroom turnover now in the region of £4M. Chris Ewbank is a former chairman and honorary member of the Society of Fine Art Auctioneers and Valuers, former chair of the RICS antiques faculty and a member of RICS governing council, and Founder of the Association of Accredited Auctioneers. The current Green Belt designation of this site constrains the ability of Ewbank’s Auction Rooms to expand, despite having land and car parking available and it is already a predominantly brownfield site. The current requirement is for an additional 700 square metre building (minimum) to accommodate existing expansion needs.

3.6 In support of excluding this site from the Green Belt, we maintain that its exclusion would not harm any of the ‘Green Belt purposes’, as will be explained in the following paragraphs.

3.7 It would not lead to unrestricted sprawl, as it has well defined boundaries, as confirmed in the Council’s own Land Availability Study 2016. It is enclosed by tree belts along its north western boundary and by hedgerows, treecover, and the A3 trunk road along its southern boundary.

3.8 Its development would not result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another. We strongly refute the statement in the Borough Council’s Employment Topic Paper – June 2017 (para 4.55) that the development of the Ewbank’s site would result in ‘perceived coalescence’. The inference is that there would be a risk of coalescence between the Ewbank’s site and the proposed development at Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow Lane, Guildford to the south west. However, this would not be the case, as the two sites are separated by countryside, and also the A3 dual-carriageway trunk road.

3.9 There would also be no encroachment into the countryside. The Ewbank’s site is predominantly ‘brownfield’, as it not only contains the Ewbank’s Auction Room buildings, but also has hard surfaced car parking for approximately 90 cars. The use of this site for employment purposes would assist in maximising the use of this brownfield site for much needed employment development, in a strategic and sustainable location.

3.10 We submit that this Plan can be made ‘sound’ by the exclusion of the Ewbank’s site from the Green Belt, as shown in Appendix B of these submissions.

4. Proposed Amendment – Designation of Ewbank’s Auction Rooms site as part of Site Allocation A58 – Strategic Employment Site (Policy A58)

4.1 The objection relates to Send Marsh/Burnt Common Amendments Nos. 1 and 3. We propose that the Ewbank’s site be included in this site allocation, described as Land around Burnt Common Warehouse, London Road, Send. Its proposed use is as a strategic employment site, for a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). It is listed in Policy E1(8) (Meeting Employment Needs), and described and defined in Policy Site A58.

4.2 We submit that this Local Plan is unsound, as it does not allocate sufficient employment land to accommodate the potential employment needs to 2034, as set out in our submissions on employment land need in Section 2 of these objections.
4.3 This addition would increase the area of this proposed strategic employment site from 9.26 hectares to 12.75 hectares. It would provide the flexibility for a mix of employment uses, including the provision of small and medium size units. It would also accommodate a new building for Ewbank’s Auction Rooms, and related car parking.

4.4 The inclusion of the Ewbank’s site would make this Plan sound, as it would then be ‘positively prepared’, being more able to respond to employment needs in the Borough for the whole period of the plan in a flexible manner. It would be ‘justified’, as it would provide a strategic employment site in a sustainable location, being within easy reach of the strategic road network. At present its limited size would be less likely to fulfil the employment land needs for the period of the Plan in this part of the Borough.

4.5 The site would also be able to be satisfactorily accommodated within the local road network, as demonstrated in the Transport Report appended to these objections (Appendix D). This Transport Report considers the impact of new employment development at the Ewbank’s site and concludes that the traffic generated from the Ewbank’s site can be satisfactorily accommodated on the local highway network.

4.6 The Transport Report includes traffic surveys carried out in July 2017 at four locations near to the Ewbank’s Site. The increased traffic which is expected to be generated by new employment (including the Ewbank’s site) is estimated. The Report then concludes that there is sufficient spare capacity on the local highway network, including local junctions, to accommodate the proposed extension of the A58 Site to incorporate the Ewbank’s Auction Rooms site.

4.7 It is also of particular relevance that this comprehensive site is acceptable to Guildford Borough Council in transport terms even without the new A3 slip roads, as it was in the Draft Local Plan in (2014) as a proposed comprehensive development of the Land around Burnt Common Warehouse (including the Ewbank’s site) for a mix of B1(c), B2, B8 and residential development, without the need for new slip roads onto the A3.

4.8 The Borough Council considers that this site is very suitable for development. In its Strategic Land Availability Assessment 2016 it states that there is no known reason why well designed commercial uses in this location, that take account of the amenities of the neighbouring properties, should have an unacceptable impact.

4.9 The key attributes of the Ewbank’s site for employment uses include:-

- It has an existing employment use on the site, comprising the Ewbank’s Auction rooms and car parking for 90 cars;
- It is on a relatively flat, mainly brownfield site;
- It has an excellent vehicular access off the London Road;
- There are no public rights of way across the site;
- It has strong natural boundaries of hedgerows and tree belts;
- It is not subject to views from the wider countryside;
- It is not subject to any statutory or non-statutory landscape, nature conservation, or cultural heritage designations;
- It is in Flood Zone 1, where development is acceptable.

4.10 In the Draft Borough Local Plan 2014, when the Ewbank’s site was included in this strategic employment site (as Site 74) this comprehensive site was described in the ‘Opportunities Commentary’ Section as ‘suitable’ for new employment uses (B1c, B2 and B8). It was considered to be available in the short term (1 – 5 years), and specific reference was made to its identification as being a ‘potential development area – B13’ in the Borough Council’s Green Belt and Countryside Study. This description of the site is an important evidence-base in support of these objections, as there has been no change in circumstances in the suitability of this whole site for strategic employment purposes.

4.11 We therefore submit that this Plan can be made ‘sound’ by the inclusion of the Ewbank’s site as part of Policy A58 land around Burnt Common Warehouse, London Road, Send (Appendix B). This would create a larger and more flexible strategic employment site, with the potential to accommodate a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8).
4.12 We further propose that the allocation of the Ewbank’s site should result in the amendment to the settlement boundary of Send Marsh/Burnt Common, for consistency with the currently proposed strategic employment area. This new boundary would be a natural extension to the settlement, with the defined boundaries of the A3 trunk road and London Road (see Appendix B).

4.13 There is also the additional benefits to the immediate highway adjacent to the Ewbank’s Site. The current access road suffers from significant onstreet parking and is poorly maintained. There would be the opportunity to improve this situation by closing the carriageway along the site edge, which could include incorporating some existing highway land within the whole Ewbank’s site, thus increasing the amount of new employment land in this recognised strategic area for new employment.

5. Conclusions

5.1 We propose that the Ewbank’s site be included within Policy/Site A58 as part of the proposed strategic employment allocation at Land around Burnt Common Warehouse. We submit that the addition of this land will make a significant contribution to the additional land for strategic employment, which we submit is required to provide the flexibility to accommodate strategic employment needs over the period of the Local Plan, to 2034. 5.2 We therefore propose amendment to the following Plans in the Local Plan; all of which are contained in Appendix E of these objections:-

- Send Marsh/Burnt Common – Amendment 1 – Additional Site Allocation A58
- Send Marsh/Burnt Common – Amendment 2 – Green Belt Boundary Amendment
- Send Marsh/Burnt Common – Amendment 3 – Strategic Employment Site

5.3 We also propose that Employment Policy E1(1) be amended to increase the proposed new industrial land (B1c, B2 and B8). This increase should at a minimum, be an additional 3.49 hectares, being the area of the Ewbank’s site.

[See attachments for Appendices]

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  Appendices A-C.pdf  (2.2 MB)
Appendix D.pdf  (3.9 MB)

Comment ID: pslp172/4202  Respondent: 11070113 / Alison Hague  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A58 BURNT COMMON – My Objections

60) Burnt Common strategic industrial employment site for light industry, storage and distribution activities. It is to be designated an Industrial Strategic Employment Site which means that it is a preferred site for industrial development including waste management facilities. The site is 9ha which it is stated allows for considerable future expansion. This will generate large amounts of traffic including heavy vehicles on the A247.

61) The A247 through West Clandon is not suited to cope with additional traffic for reasons including: (i) although notionally an A-road the A247 is narrow and winding in parts and is most unsuited to carrying additional traffic, (ii) the A247 has a single non-continuous footpath in several sections, (iii) a care home, a church car park and a pub, as well as very many houses, are located on the opposite side of the road to the only footpath, making pedestrian access difficult for people moving about the village on foot, especially for elderly and disabled people; (iv) the railway station and other commercial and residential properties have poor sight lines for access onto the A247 and difficulties in accessing the A247 from these properties will be exacerbated by increased traffic volume (and fewer “gaps” between cars); (v) the
A247 is popular with cyclists and because of its narrow and winding nature the potential for accidents that additional traffic will cause is clear.

62) The A247 may be an A-road on the map but in reality it is a residential road with numerous bends, narrow sections and side-entrances. The road through West Clandon already has numerous accident black spots, such as: (i) the exit from Clandon station which has extremely poor sight lines due to a humped back bridge where numerous accidents have occurred; (ii) the exit from the Onslow Arms pub which is almost blind due to the pub building being adjacent the road - a vehicle has recently ended up in the garden of the cottage opposite; (iii) the narrow section outside “Summers” which is regularly littered with the wing mirrors of cars which have made contact, as well as being a dangerous area for pedestrians due to vehicles mounting the pavement to try to pass; (iv) the winding section outside Clandon Regis and near the primary school which regularly suffers from demolition of gate posts and fences as vehicles leave the road; (v) the bend near West Clandon church which has seen damage caused to the flint wall in recent years.

63) I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site.

64) This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

65) The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

66) There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.“

67) There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

68) The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over-allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

69) The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607 sq.m. of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750 sq.m. of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357 sq.m. in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

70) 38,357 sq. m. of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. If you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq. m.. approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

71) The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357 sq.m.

72) The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

73) It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
74) The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

75) The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

76) The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/823  **Respondent:** 11070401 / Vicki Groden  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A58**

I **object** to the fact that the employment floorspace which was moved from Garlick’s Arch to Burnt Common has changed from “ up to” 7000 sq m to a “ minimum of 7000 sq m with a potential for further industrial floorspace to meet future borough needs”. The site at Burnt Common is over 9 ha ( over 90,000 sq m). The language of the policy A58 opens this site to unlimited development well beyond what is in the Local Plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4454  **Respondent:** 11074465 / Louise Vaughan  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3531  Respondent: 11077025 / David Williamson  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A58 change for the following reasons:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft as a direct result of the huge number of objections made previously

- The parameters of allocation of land for industrial or warehousing use has changed from "a maximum of 7,000 sq m" to "a minimum of 7,000 sq m" in the 2016 plan

- Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and units. There is no need for this development in the middle of Green Belt land

- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for the whole borough

- Hence, an allocation of over 10 hectares just at Send in Green Belt land is utterly unnecessary

- The increase in heavy traffic would cause gridlock on local roads, and an increase in air pollution and danger to local residents and children
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4268  Respondent: 11095905 / Joanna Holden  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We object to Policy A58 for land at Burnt Common as there has been a decline in demand for industrial land since the original plan, not an increase. There is land already available at Slyfield and in Guildford itself for industrial use of the type proposed so there is no need for this development. The extra traffic from any such development will lead to traffic gridlock on roads that already suffer gridlock at the slightest incident.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2738  Respondent: 11097729 / Sheila Brown  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A58 for land at Burnt Common, London Road, Send to now have a new allocation for a minimum, of 7,000 sq m of industrial warehousing because

• this is really unnecessary when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
• Such a development will have a significant impact on the surrounding roads and cause traffic gridlock which is almost at that point already at peak times.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4457  Respondent: 11098369 / Neil & Nicki Covington  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4493  Respondent: 11098977 / Jilly Cooper  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing
pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1804  Respondent: 11100193 / Michael Turner  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A58 land at Burnt Common, London Rd I object to a new allocation of 7,000 sq m of industrial or warehousing which was deleted from the 2015 draft. I also object to the wording of the allocation: the 2016 "maximum" allocation of 7,000 sq m has now been changed to "minimum". There is a surplus of industrial premises in the borough and the requirement for further industrial/warehousing has not been proven. The road infrastructure is inadequate and there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant development on the green belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4157  Respondent: 11104033 / David Dutton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A58 land at Burnt Common, London Rd I object to a new allocation of 7,000 sq m of industrial or warehousing which was deleted from the 2015 draft. I also object to the wording of the allocation: the 2016 "maximum" allocation of 7,000 sq m has now been changed to "minimum". There is a surplus of industrial premises in the borough and the requirement for further industrial/warehousing has not been proven. The road infrastructure is inadequate and there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant development on the green belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- **Burnt Common** strategic industrial employment site for light industry, storage and distribution activities. It is to be designated an Industrial Strategic Employment Site which means that it is a preferred site for industrial development including waste management facilities. The site is 9ha which it is stated allows for considerable future expansion. This will generate large amounts of traffic including heavy vehicles on the A247.
- The A247 through West Clandon is not suited to cope with additional traffic for reasons including: (i) although notionally an A-road the A247 is narrow and winding in parts and is most unsuited to carrying additional traffic, (ii) the A247 has a single non-continuous footpath in several sections, (iii) a care home, a church car park and a pub, as well as very many houses, are located on the opposite side of the road to the only footpath, making pedestrian access difficult for people moving about the village on foot, especially for elderly and disabled people; (iv) the railway station and other commercial and residential properties have poor sight lines for access onto the A247 and difficulties in accessing the A247 from these properties will be exacerbated by increased traffic volume (and fewer “gaps” between cars); (v) the A247 is popular with cyclists and because of its narrow and winding nature the potential for accidents that additional traffic will cause is clear.
- The A247 may be an A-road on the map but in reality it is a residential road with numerous bends, narrow sections and side-entrances. The road through West Clandon already has numerous accident black spots, such as: (i) the exit from Clandon station which has extremely poor sight lines due to a humped back bridge where numerous accidents have occurred; (ii) the exit from the Onslow Arms pub which is almost blind due to the pub building being adjacent the road - a vehicle has recently ended up in the garden of the cottage opposite; (iii) the narrow section outside “Summers” which is regularly littered with the wing mirrors of cars which have made contact, as well as being a dangerous area for pedestrians due to vehicles mounting the pavement to try to pass; (iv) the winding section outside Clandon Regis and near the primary school which regularly suffers from demolition of gate posts and fences as vehicles leave the road; (v) the bend near West Clandon church which has seen damage caused to the flint wall in recent years.
- I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site.
- This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
- The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
- There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over-allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
- The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607 sq.m. of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750 sq.m. of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357 sq.m. in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
- 38,357 sq. m. of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. If you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq. m. approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
- The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the
poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357 sq.m.
• The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
• It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
• The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
• The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
• The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2420  Respondent: 11159809 / Hilary Road  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 and the allocation of 9.26 hectares of Greenbelt land at Burnt Common. The 7,000 square feet of industrial space is "open ended"

Where is the evidence of need or demand for this.?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3759  Respondent: 11164225 / David Avery  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

• It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
• The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land
• There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
• The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt
• The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
• It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to this site being included as well as Garlicks Arch, again this generates yet more congestion and pollution in this area. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the green belt as Slyford and Guildford have empty sites and industrial units. Indeed one of the successes of Guildford in recent years has been in digital technology developments, it is unlikely that there will be a need for a large increase in the number of industrial units in the future.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A.58, Now a new allocation for a minimum of 7,000 sq m of industrial or warehousing, I object to the word “minimum” now being shown which has changed from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 Plan because since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. But I especially object as this was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously.

I object to Policy A.58 because it will mean we will join/absorb into villages against the reasoning of the Green Belt which is to protect natural or semi natural environments, protect unique character of rural communities that might be absorbed by expanding suburbs. I object to the impact it will have on the surrounding main roads and back smaller roads that already suffer traffic congestion.

I object to the need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt because Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units. The ‘2017 Employment Land Need Assessment’ showed a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough, not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

POLICY A58 Land at Burnt Common, London Road

I object – Originally it could have been a good use of this land at Burnt Common to be used for industrial or warehousing, however I have serious concerns that the allocation of a ‘minimum’ of 7,000 sq m of employment floor-
space makes it open to further development in the future. I understood that there had been a decline in the need for land for industrial use? (See 'Employment Land Need Assessment' 2017).

We already have a very busy main road through Send, very congested at peak times and by having another site which large HGV have to access and may come through via Send Road from Woking, the current proposal on this site is unacceptable.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2482</th>
<th>Respondent: 15062145 / Philippa Hackett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to Policy A58 for a minimum of 7,000 sq m of employment floorspace at Burnt Common, London Road. Originally this site was proposed for development in 2014, this was then replaced in 2016 by Garlick's Arch on the other side of the road so if could include a new road junction onto the A3. Now it is proposed that both sites are used. This is clearly overdevelopment in one area. The traffic chaos this will create in and around the whole area has not been thought through as all traffic heading to Woking (and the main train station) will have to go down the single road through Send. Apart from access to the A all other traffic will have to go through the villages of Send, Clandon or Ripley and will impact on Ockham the other side of Ripley. The wording has also changed from maximum to minimum which would suggest that more square footage is probable. I do not understand the need to build an industrial site here when there are still empty sites and units at Slyfield, Guildford. I would suggest that the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment should by looked at by the Council as there is a massive over allocation of land in Send for this purpose.

I can understand the problems that Guildford Borough Council face with the development of the Borough especially as so much of it is in the Green Belt. However, more creative uses of brown field sites and existing sites should be sought rather than destroying the Green Belt for future generations. If you use only a small percentage now, then in 2034 another small percentage is used and so on, every 15 years, there will no longer be the 'green lungs' for southwest London.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/302</th>
<th>Respondent: 15062625 / Stephen Groves</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because it ignores all previous objections made about industrial land in this location and has been added once again to the proposal after being previously removed due to public objection. The plan has changed the requirements from Maximum to Minimum of 700sq m of industrial land and there is no evidence to support this area being desirable, or necessary, for industrial expansion especially when Slyfield and Guildford still have industrial sites which are not fully utilised. The impact of industrial usage like this on small surrounding roads will be highly significant and will, once again, join Send as a Super Village to the surrounding villages whilst having a damaging impact on the surrounding green belt areas.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
**Comment ID:** pslp172/3281  **Respondent:** 15062657 / Wendy Corrigan  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• This was rightly deleted from the 2014 draft proposals, because of objections raised. It now appears that the ‘maximum’ size in the 2016 draft has changed to ‘minimum’ size, despite the fact that there is now less demand for industrial development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What is the rationale to building industrial warehousing on Green Belt land when there are empty sites and units in Slyfield and at other Guildford sites?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 'The Employment Land Need Assessment 2017’ indicates reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares of industrial land for the WHOLE BOROUGH, yet 10 hectares is proposed for Send in the Green Belt. WHY?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The defined local villages will merge - defeating one of the purposes of the Green Belt, and the resulting impact on traffic using the small local roads will be hazardous, and add to pollution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1102  **Respondent:** 15063745 / John Pryce  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy A58, Burnt Common Land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This part of the plan was deleted from the 2014 draft, because of all the objections raised. There is no reason why it should now be re-instated. 

There is no demand for warehouse or industrial development on this part of the Green Belt when there are empty sites and industrial units at Slyfield and Guildford.

As with Policy A43, the increased traffic will cause gridlock to the already over-subscribed A3 as well as the local roads in Ripley and Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2361  **Respondent:** 15064673 / Steven Yadav  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

Roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2364  Respondent: 15064673 / Steven Yadav  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

1. The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, … (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]”
2. The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2848  Respondent: 15067393 / Anthony Fairbairn  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A58. Now a new a/location for a minimum of 7,000 sq m of industrial or warehousing I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:

• It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
• The word "minimum" is a change from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land
• There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
• The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt
• The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
• It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2846  Respondent: 15067425 / Anita Fairbairn  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A58. Now a new a/location for a minimum of 7,000 sq m of industrial or warehousing I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:
• It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
• The word "minimum" is a change from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land
• There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
• The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt
• The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
• It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3663  Respondent: 15067585 / Ann Elms  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common and I am a resident very close to this development. Thousands of objections were received previously and it was taken out of the 2014 draft and it now back in but with a possible huge increase in the number of industrial units. There is plenty of room at Slyfield and Guildford where there are still empty sites and industrial units. I understand the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough so it really is unreasonable to allocate 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt area.

Again there will be traffic gridlock with traffic leaving this industrial site, meeting traffic coming up Send Barns Lane, and the whole traffic circulation will become untenable for residents and traffic passing through the area.

Ripley and Send will again be forced into becoming a sprawling suburb and will lose their village atmospheres and cultures.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/169  Respondent: 15068737 / Angela Blaydon  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
I object to Policy A58, because

1. it was deleted from the 2014 draft;
2. is now a minimum instead of the original maximum square meterage;
3. there is no demand for industrial land in the area, which is Green Belt, when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.0 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt;
4. again, this will impact significantly on small local roads creating traffic gridlock;
5. it will also remove the Green Belt land between Ripley and Send, defeating the purpose of Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to policy A58 at Burntcommon;

it was deleted from the 2014 draft because of objections but now has been re-added to the plan. along with Garlick's arch which previously replaced it. Even worse, the word minimum has been changed to maximum, despite a decline in demand for industrial land. Why plan an industrial development in the middle of the greenbelt, when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty units? The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough, not an excessive allocation of 10 hectares at Send, once again, this is green belt land and should not be built on. The increased traffic caused by this development and the Garlick's arch development and the new a3 junction will choke our village to death with congestion.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Land at Burn Common, London Road, Policy A58

I object to Policy A58 at Burn Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
- The word ‘minimum’ is a change from the previous ‘maximum’ in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in the demand for industrial land
• There is no need to build industrial or warehouse developments in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
• The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt
• The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
• It will join up the existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2357  Respondent: 15081505 / Victoria Yadav  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch)

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

1. The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, … (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]”
2. The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2360  Respondent: 15081505 / Victoria Yadav  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Land at Burn Common, London Road, Policy A58

I object to Policy A58 at Burn Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously.
- The word ‘minimum’ is a change from the previous ‘maximum’ in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in the demand for industrial land.
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse developments in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
- It will join up the existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1.1 I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site.

1.2 This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

1.3 The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sqm at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

1.4 There is in fact no justification for building anymore industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

1.5 There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
1.6 The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

1.7 The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

1.8 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

1.9 The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

1.10 The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

1.11 It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

1.12 The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

1.13 The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

1.14 The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

1.15 I object to the potential impact of para 4.4.23a on Burnt Common with its over allocation of industrial zoning is subterfuge for a waste management facility which is a dishonest and underhand approach to planning and proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3074  **Respondent:** 15094369 / Marilyn Scott  **Agent:**
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 change. It has previously been deleted because of major objections. There is no need to build industrial buildings in the centre of the green belt when Slyfield still has empty sites. The impact on surrounding rural roads will cause excessive traffic congestion. It will defeat the purpose of the green belt in preserving the rural area. There is no proven need for industrial buildings in the Send Ripley area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/173  **Respondent:** 15097345 / Rosemary Key  **Agent:**
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 because increasing the industrial area and its associated increase of larger vehicles traffic will again impact on the local infrastructure. The roads and motorway access are not in a state to manage this increase in heavy traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1639  **Respondent:** 15097697 / Lisa Bedworth  **Agent:**
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A58

I object to this policy because:

It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously. The fact that it is now included shows a failure of process and a lack of democracy.

It now includes the word "minimum" which is a change from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan and there has been a decline in demand for industrial land so this makes no sense at all and opens this site to unlimited development well beyond what is in the local plan.
Building industrial/warehouse in the middle of the Green Belt is outrageous, particularly when there are empty sites and industrial units at Slyfield and Guildford.

The impact on the traffic in Send and Ripley will be considerable and it is already extremely busy. There are many children and cyclists on these roads and their safety will undoubtedly be compromised by the additional heavy traffic.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1834  **Respondent:** 15099489 / Christine Vinten  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**Land at Burnt Common, London Road Policy A58**

I object to Policy A58 because it was deleted from the 2014 draft reflecting the objections that had previously been made. Also the word ‘minimum’ is a change from the word ‘maximum’ used in the 2016 draft and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. I do not believe there is a need to build industrial or warehouse development in a green belt area when both Slyfield and Guildford have empty sites. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction of demand of 3.9 hectares across the borough which shows the increase of 10 hectares in Send is completely unjustified. This development will have adverse effect on traffic volumes in local roads. The development will join up existing villages thus defeating the purpose of the Green Belt.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1682  **Respondent:** 15099745 / Duncan Vinten  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**Land at Burnt Common, London Road Policy A58**

I object to Policy A58 because it was deleted from the 2014 draft reflecting the objections that had previously been made. Also the word ‘minimum’ is a change from the word ‘maximum’ used in the 2016 draft and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. I do not believe there is a need to build industrial or warehouse development in a green belt area when both Slyfield and Guildford have empty sites. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction of demand of 3.9 hectares across the borough which shows the increase of 10 hectares in Send is completely unjustified. This development will have adverse effect on traffic volumes in local roads. The development will join up existing villages thus defeating the purpose of the Green Belt.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/360  **Respondent:** 15102049 / Malcolm Holland  **Agent:**
I object to Policy A58

1. originally deleted because of previous objections
2. industrial land in decline
3. Space still available Slyfield and other Guildford industrial sites
4. Reduction in demand for whole borough to 3.9 hectares whereas this proposal is for 10
5. again traffic problems more health problems due to the car fumes
6. joining two villages in green belt area

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A58

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because it was deleted from the 2014 draft because of previous objections and there is no requirement in the area for a minimum of 7,000 sq m of industrial warehousing. It will impact the small surrounding roads, and the traffic will be gridlocked. The Ripley exit off the A3 in both directions is already treacherous with cars speeding through the area to cut through Send and Ripley villages. There is no demand for industrial warehousing in this area when there are warehouses available and empty in Slyfield Green which is purpose built for industrial units. It will only erode the Green Belt further and join up Ripley and Sand villages unnecessarily.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
this area and there are warehouses in Slyfield Green which is purpose built for industrial use and are currently empty. It will erode the Green Belt further and join up Ripley and Send villages unnecessarily.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/213  Respondent: 15107041 / Andy Williams  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposals to provide an allocation for a minimum of 7,000 sq m of industrial or warehousing on the land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A58, for the following reasons:

- This was deleted from the 2014 draft based on previous objections, why should it be resurfaced when there is no need to build industrial or warehouse space in the middle of the Green Belt? Guildford and Slyfield have empty sites and industrial units already, the requirement for more space does not exist
- Since the 2016 plan there has been a decline in demand for industrial land (as proven in the point above re: empty units)
- The 2017 employment land need assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares in Send in the Green Belt
- Infrastructure cannot support this. Traffic and pollution levels are already a major problem
- By joining up the villages there would be no definition between Ripley & Send defeating the purpose of the Green Belt

Yet again, having to write to raise objections to an ill-considered plan that has not been amended, despite the volume of previous objections, really demonstrates a lack of competence in this space. It is infuriating to local residents who yet again have to ‘go into battle’ with a local council that clearly is not listening to the community, it’s a complete discourse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/514  Respondent: 15107777 / Paul Ayers  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 (Burnt Common, change to a minimum of 7000 sq m industrial land) changes because:

It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of valid objections

The word maximum in the 2016 plan has been changed to minimum.

Since 2016 there has been a decline in demand for industrial land, not an increase

There is suitable vacant land for industry in Slyfield

The impact on local roads will cause traffic gridlock
It defeats the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2549  Respondent: 15109121 / Larry Bottomley  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because it ignores all previous comments that caused its withdrawal from the 2014 draft, there is no demonstrable case for the requirement for such a development while sites remain empty at Slyfield, and the change of “maximum” to “minimum” in has no commercial basis. This development will only contribute to the chronic traffic problems in the area. This development requires material traffic management measures through Send and Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1281  Respondent: 15114017 / Jo Wright  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the change to Policy A58, Burnt Common, London Road

  1. The area is close to Slyfield, therefore does not require an additional industrial estate.
  2. There is a decline in demand for industrial land since the 2016 proposal
  3. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2307  Respondent: 15114721 / Leslie Macnair  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch)

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

  1. *The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, … (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]”*
2. The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2310</th>
<th>Respondent: 15114721 / Leslie Macnair</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/817</th>
<th>Respondent: 15115201 / Katherine Mutton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 Land at Burnt Common, London Road changes

- There are currently empty industrial sites available and there is a reduction in the demand for industrial land in this area.
- The traffic generated and pollution will affect the village of Send hugely.
- The wording has been changed from maximum in the previous plan to minimum.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1065</th>
<th>Respondent: 15131425 / Roger Mutton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the Policy A58 at Burnt Common because it was deleted from the 2014 draft, also the wording change minimum from the earlier draft of maximum.

The 2017 Employment Land needs shows the requirement is dropping in terms of land required. The proposed 10 hectares is vastly more than the 3.9 which is proposed for the whole Borough, this cannot be allowed to go through.

Additionally it adds to the increase of vehicular traffic in the surrounding roads and is another added pollution burden which the area should not be asked to bear.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1068   Respondent: 15131425 / Roger Mutton   Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A58 at Burnt Common because it was deleted from the 2014 draft, also the wording change minimum from the earlier draft of maximum. The 2017 Employment Land needs shows the requirement is dropping in terms of land required. The proposed 10 hectares is vastly more than the 3.9 which is proposed for the whole Borough, this cannot be allowed to go through. Additionally it adds to the increase of vehicular traffic in the surrounding roads and is another added pollution burden which the area should not be asked to bear.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1012   Respondent: 15136513 / Ian Mitchell   Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch)

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

1. The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh / Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, … (site allocation A25) than the Burnt Common site did”
2. The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore, GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives. Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included in the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1015   Respondent: 15136513 / Ian Mitchell   Agent:
I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the policy A58 proposing a minimum of 7,000 sq m if industrial or warehousing land. This proposal was deleted from the 2014 draft because of the number of objections. How can this be added again in 2017? There is no need to build commercial development on Green Belt especially when Slyfield and Guildford have empty sites and industrial units. The evidence shows a reduction in demand for industrial land (2017 Employment Land Need Assessment).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the changes to policy A58 at Burnt common because GBC have changed this from a maximum of 7000 sq m of industrial space to a Minimum of 7000 sq m of industrial space, did you think we would not notice this?

There is simply no need to build in the middle of the Green belt when Slyfield & Guildford still have empty sites. In fact the latest research shows a reduction in the demand for industrial space. Yet again there were thousands of objections logged last time, and the proposal was dropped, so why is GBC reinstating it?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2539  Respondent: 15143937 / Helen Strudwick  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed employment space at Burnt Common (formerly planned for Garlick’s Arch) as the increase in HGV traffic, should this go ahead, will cause more congestion and damage to the roads in and around Send. This was deleted from the 2014 draft due to the number of objections but following the smoke and mirrors move to the Garlick’s Arch site in 2016, it has now appeared back in its original location but with the maximum 7,000 square meterage now as the minimum – absolutely ludicrous. Since the 2016 plan there has been a decline in demand for industrial land and there is no need to create this from Green Belt land when Slyfield still has empty sites and industrial units. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares of industrial land for the whole of the borough yet the language of this policy A58 opens this site, of in excess of 9 hectares, to unlimited development well beyond what is in the Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3295  Respondent: 15143937 / Helen Strudwick  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed employment space at Burnt Common (formerly planned for Garlick’s Arch) as the increase in HGV traffic, should this go ahead, will cause more congestion and damage to the roads in and around Send. This was deleted from the 2014 draft due to the number of objections but following the smoke and mirrors move to the Garlick’s Arch site in 2016, it has now appeared back in its original location but with the maximum 7,000 square meterage now as the minimum – absolutely ludicrous. Since the 2016 plan there has been a decline in demand for industrial land and there is no need to create this from Green Belt land when Slyfield still has empty sites and industrial units. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares of industrial land for the whole of the borough yet the language of this policy A58 opens this site, of in excess of 9 hectares, to unlimited development well beyond what is in the Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp172/1529  Respondent: 15144545 / Stacey Maxwell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. With regards to the A58 Burnt Common Site, the potential for a substantial increase in industrial floorspace from 7000 sq m to an unspecified amount is completely unacceptable. There has not been sufficient information provided to local residents and therefore takes away our rights for a proper and thorough consultation. This is underhanded. How on earth can this be acceptable, in a rural environment, to increase the amount of heavy goods vehicles that will be using our surrounding roads?

2. With regards to the A58 Burnt Common Site, there has been a brief mention of a Waste Management Facility (which has been conveniently made less prominent in policy 4.4.23a) – this must go through a formal and proper consultation. Again, this is underhanded by Guildford Borough Council.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1863  Respondent: 15144737 / L M Wells  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the policy change A58 at Burnt Common London Road because -

1. The word 'maximum' is a change from "minimum" and industrial development is unsuitable.
2. Heavy vehicular traffic from such a site would create further congestion and pollution.

It is particularly disturbing that there has been little or no effort on the part of the Council to ameliorate the very legitimate concerns of local people. These concerns therefore are as relevant to the latest draft Local Plan as the earlier version of the document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2878  Respondent: 15145057 / Vincent Francois  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

New Policy A58 : I object to GBC's proposal to build 400 houses and 7,000sq.m. employment space (light industrial/storage, warehousing) on virgin Green Belt around Send! Send Marsh/Burnt Common
• This construction would remove vast areas of Green Belt open space
• The policy seeks to increase the area of land to be extracted from the Green Retl br a minimum of 7,000 sq.m of 'employment floorspace. The word minimum used leaves the door open for future development
• There would be a very severe and adverse environmental impact not only on the two villages, but throughout the whole surrounding area, overdeveloping the local rural communities and creating major traffic problems.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2711</th>
<th>Respondent: 15145121 / Irene Francois</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New policy A58 - Industrial space on land around Burnt Common, London Road. This new policy seeks to increase the area of Green Belt land to be sacrificed for additional light industry and warehousing. GBC states a minimum of 7,000 sq. m of employment floor space. The use of the word minimum rather than maximum is duly noted as it leaves the door open for further future development.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2091</th>
<th>Respondent: 15145313 / T G Wells</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to the policy change A58 at Burnt Common London Road because -

1. The word 'maximum' is a change from "minimum" and industrial development is unsuitable.
2. Heavy vehicular traffic from such a site would create further congestion and pollution.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/833</th>
<th>Respondent: 15146049 / Ian Tulloch</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the changes to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because :-

There is no need to build industrial or warehouse developments in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy No 58 I object most strongly

This is a most inappropriate area for industrial/warehousing. Guildford already has empty sites in Slyfield and the local roads would struggle with heavy transport. Once again it is Greenbelt!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Again, despite numerous previous objections, the Council have now allocated this site for a minimum of 7,000 sq m of industrial space, instead of the previous maximum of 7,000 sq m, thereby creating the opportunity for unlimited development on this site in the future. These proposals are an unnecessary and inappropriate development within the Green Belt and will only increase the existing traffic gridlock in this area.

It is particularly disappointing that Guildford Borough Council have made so little attempt to address the genuine concerns of the Send community and that the proposals in the current draft Local Plan if implemented would actually have an even worse impact on the community than the 2016 proposals.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to the Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

-There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units

-The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock

-It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/288  Respondent: 15172705 / Geraldine Brown  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY A58

If we don't need the industrial units at Burnt Common why build them. It's all more traffic on the A3 and that seems to be gridlocked nealy every day.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/585  Respondent: 15174145 / Kathleen Mylet  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A58 at Burntcommon because there is no need for additional industrial or warehouse development, in the middle of the Green Belt, when there are loads of empty sites at Slyfield and Guildford.

   It will have an adverse effect on the narrow roads of Send and will lead to gridlock.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/211  Respondent: 15177313 / Stephen Brunskill  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A58 because this enormous industrial development is simply not needed. Slyfield estate has empty units and also space to extend into and they want to do it so there will be no objections!! I object to the underhand wording in the plan of changing from a “maximum” 7,000 sq ft to a “minimum” of 7,000 sq ft. This development will also cause traffic chaos in the area. Most mornings when the A3 backs up at the M25 junction people come off at the Send slip onto the B2215 (past this proposed development) and follow it through Ripley trying to cut out some of the traffic queue. This backs up the Portsmouth road causing further issue at the junction with Send Marsh Road and at the roundabout with the A247. A huge industrial park with the associated articulated lorries etc will only exacerbate the problem and make the traffic untenable. In addition if you then create an on/off ramp to the A3 on the A247 then this junction will become the main route into Woking for traffic coming from the South on the M25 and it will result in traffic gridlock. This has not been thought through
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3403  Respondent: 15178369 / Geoffrey Wilkinson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Again, despite numerous previous objections, the Council have now allocated this site for a minimum of 7,000 sq. m of industrial space, instead of the previous maximum of 7,000 sq. m, thereby creating the opportunity for unlimited development on this site in the future. These proposals are an unnecessary and inappropriate development within the Green Belt and will only increase the existing traffic gridlock in this area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1652  Respondent: 15180193 / Paul Bedworth  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A58

a. It was deleted from the 2014 draft due to the number of objections made: why is it back? Another example of a process that does not follow – logically or make sense for democracy.

b. Where is the proven demand for warehousing? If it is there, why are other local units lying empty, for example in Slyfield? I understand that the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment concludes that there is a REDUCTIUON in demand in industrial land for the borough (3.9 hectares) so why is a proposal to increase by 10 hectares at Burntcommon even being considered? Once again the process seems completely illogical, not “joined up” or at worse, broken.

c. Why would you sacrifice green belt when there is brown field sites available?

d. It will create gridlock on the surrounding roads.

e. It will destroy the character of the local area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2056  Respondent: 15183393 / D Greenman  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A58

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common. This plan was deleted from the 2014 draft due to the volume of objections, why has it been reinstated?? The word "minimum" has been changed from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan. Since then there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. There is no need to build industrial or warehousing on Green Belt. This should be built on Brown field sites, not in a rural setting. Slyfield and the surrounding industrial estates still have empty industrial units so why build more. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole of the Borough so again why build 10 hectares at Send on Green Belt.

What incentives are being given to GBC / Councillors to push this through ??? The increase of traffic from this Policy Plan will cause major traffic congestion in an area which is already suffering.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/512</th>
<th>Respondent: 15184993 / Muriel Millar</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to policy A58 because any industrial use of Burntcommon is unnecessary, let alone the unlimited " minimum 7,000 square m." cited.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3331</th>
<th>Respondent: 15185857 / Matthew Monk</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirdly, I object to policy A58 of a minimum of 7,000 sq m of industrial warehousing because of the change from ‘maximum’ in the previous plan to ‘minimum’ in the current plan despite a decline in the demand. This is proven by empty sights in Slyfield and Guildford which should all be filled first. The 2017 Employment Land need assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough so why has Send been earmarked a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in green belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3322</th>
<th>Respondent: 15186273 / Suzannah Monk</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thirdly, I object to policy A58 of a minimum of 7,000 sq m of industrial warehousing because of the change from ‘maximum’ in the previous plan to ‘minimum’ in the current plan despite a decline in the demand. This is proven by empty sights in Slyfield and Guildford which should all be filled first.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Policy A58 Land at Burnt Common, Send.

I object, in that this had previously been deleted from the 2014 Draft owing to the objections raised and there is no demand for industrial land in the middle of Green Belt when there are still empty sites at Slyfield. Once again the traffic generated would cause gridlock on already very congested roads. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment show a reduction in demand for the whole borough to 3.9 hectares and to over allocate 10 hectares to Send is entirely disproportionate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1148</th>
<th>Respondent: 15199009 / Alan Toomey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to policy A58 Burnt Common because you have included the wording 'minimum' guess you hoped we would not notice, the extra local traffic would make exiting the A3 unsafe and not somewhere your would want to base a business, there is actually no demand for new industrial land as plenty is available at Slyfields which has better access. Again this is in the middle of greenbelt, you are ignoring thousands of previous objections from 2014.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1398</th>
<th>Respondent: 15205921 / Elizabeth Howlett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I Object to Policy A58 the construction of an industrial complex at Burnt Common. There is no need. If there is a need in Guildford it needs to be closer to Guildford Centre. There are several light industrial sites in Guildford and Woking that are an inefficient use of the space available. All need rebuilding with proper access to local roads, and some would provide space on the River Way frontage for council houses. I object to the term low cost housing, they are not value for money but cheap, poorly designed with insufficient storage, narrow staircases and little parking, irregular bus service and too far from the needs of those resident.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1720</th>
<th>Respondent: 15220097 / Douglas Barr Trudy Amos</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A58.
Now a new allocation for a minimum of 7,000 sq m of industrial or warehousing
We object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
- The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
- It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1228  Respondent: 15225281 / Roger Gamlin  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A58 Burnt Common.
I object to Policy A58 because there is no need or demand for extra industrial space when there are empty units at Slyfield.
The impact on the small surrounding roads will bring traffic chaos to the area.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1722  Respondent: 15238049 / Glenda Charlick  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
The proposed Waste Management facility at site A58 Burnt common does not allow for a proper consultation.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1695  Respondent: 15241313 / Christine Relf  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) , is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A58 at Burnt common

1) there is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

2) the impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

3) it will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of Green Belt

4) the 2017 employment land need assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2286  Respondent: 15248161 / Fabio Ligi  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:

- Again this will be in the Green Belt which must not be exploited. There is industrial capacity at Slyfield and Guildford and we do not need further sites, particularly on the GB.

- This proposed development was already deleted from the 2014 draft plan – it is obvious that local people are dead against this plan!

- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows also that there is no such requirement for 10 hectares of land to be developed, indeed it shows a reduced demand of 3.9 for the entire borough – there is no need to build on the Green Belt.

- Our roads cannot support the increased level of traffic. Our roads are narrow and some are country lanes. At present we find huge lorries mounting pavements, stuck down narrow lanes. This area is not appropriate for this kind of development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1375  Respondent: 15248481 / Jamie McCallister  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)
The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4067  Respondent: 15251105 / Michael McGrath  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

I object to the Policy A58 change with a proposed “minimal” allocation of industrial or warehousing space because:

• A “minimal” allocation is open-ended and exposes the land to unknown future development encroachment, where such a proposed allocation already breaches the law which is meant to prevent local authorities allowing building on Green Belt unless special circumstances exist.

• No special circumstances exist to encroach upon this area of Green Belt and remove it forever, as the ‘2017 Land Needs Assessment’ shows a reduction of 3.9 hectares of industrial land being required for the whole of Guildford Borough.

• The proposed allocation of over 10 hectares of industrial land at this location is contrary to the reduction mentioned above.

• There is no justifiable case for creating more industrial units in Send when Guildford, including the dedicated commercial site at Slyfield, have vacant sites.

• The proposed additional industrial space at this site would worsen the already overburdened A3 and M25 traffic flows in the area where Highways England have no funded plans to increase vehicle capacity on these major routes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3535  Respondent: 15253953 / Olivia Bedworth  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Burn Common, London Road, Policy A58 I object to Policy A58 at Burn Common because:

• It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
• The word ‘minimum’ is a change from the previous ‘maximum’ in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in the demand for industrial land
• There is no need to build industrial or warehouse developments in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
• The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
It will join up the existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3306  Respondent: 15257953 / Brian Middlemiss  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A58 on the grounds of taking more Green Belt to build warehouse and industrial units when there seems to be plenty of empty units in more appropriate sites elsewhere in Guildford and surrounding areas. This would again add more inappropriate traffic to the village and elsewhere locally.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1875  Respondent: 15262305 / L J Crane  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4628  Respondent: 15263073 / James Walker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline
developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been
consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and
Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land
for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment
floor space defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for
an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of
4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space
than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to
develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately
half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial
space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced
by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the
poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot
apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs
Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

11. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use
classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand
dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

12. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for
proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4608</th>
<th>Respondent: 15264001 / Robert Peake</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial
Strategic Employment Site

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the
objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has
been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to
build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density
of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt
Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is
double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing
pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline
developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been
consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A 58

I object to policy A 58 at Burnt common because.

a. There is no obvious need to build a warehouse development in the middle of a green belt when the industrial site at Slyfield Green Guildford could comfortably accommodate more warehouse development.

b. As with policy A 43 this policy would seriously effect the traffic volume which is already a huge problem in this location.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3480  Respondent: 15274369 / Trevor Deacon  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A 58.

Now a new allocation for a minimum of 7,000 sq m of industrial or warehousing

I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:

• The word "minimum" is a change from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan this gives no restriction to the overall size of the site whereas surely the purpose of the plan is to define the extent.
• There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt.
• The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock. The existing road (B2215) is already daily blocked by lorries using the site. The additional traffic will further block the surrounding single track and other surrounding minor roads. The existing A247 and B2215 roundabout already causes gridlock at peak times.
• The current Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand not an excessively oversized destroying the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2785  Respondent: 15278369 / Ripley Parish Council (Jim Morris)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Allocation A58 and Amendments to Policy E1.
3.2 E1(4) identifies the Strategic Employment Sites as making up the borough’s core supply of employment land. A sub class of Strategic Employment Sites are Industrial Strategic Employment Sites. There are 11 existing Industrial SES
identified in the policy at D1(7). Industrial SES are treated as suitable for B1(c) light industrial, B2 general industrial and B8 storage and distribution.

3.3 However, paragraph 4.4.32a of the “Reasoned justification” states: “Development involving waste management facilities may be appropriate and will be directed to the Industrial Strategic Employment Sites. The Surrey Waste Plan (2006) policy CW5: Location of Waste Facilities gives priority to industrial/employment sites, particularly those in urban areas, and to any other suitable urban sites and then to sites close to urban areas and to sites easily accessible by the strategic road network. Some waste management activities fall within the industrial classes in the Use Classes Order and can be considered to be a B1c, B2 or B8 use. This is particularly the case given the increased move towards enclosing waste management activities in purpose designed buildings. However, some do not fall within specific use classes and are therefore sui generis use.”

3.4 To the existing core of employment sites is proposed the allocation (A58) an additional Industrial Strategic Employment Site at Burnt Common (Amendment 1). The proposal is for 7000 square metres of space within use classes B1(c) (light industrial), B2 General Industrial and B8 Storage and Distribution, and “with potential for further industrial floorspace to meet borough needs”. No justification or criteria are provided to explain its identification or selection but it is assumed that it is based on the existing warehouse on the site having established an employment use of the site.

3.5 The site is currently in the Green Belt and it is proposed that the GB boundary will be amended to exclude the entire site (Amendment 2).

3.6 Policy E1(8) (as amended) states: “When developed the new employment land at Burnt Common, together with the existing employment floorspace, will be treated as Industrial Strategic Employment Land.”

3.7 These amendments taken together cause a number of specific concerns on the basis of which the Parish Council OBJECTS to the proposed amendments.

3.8 Effectively new Allocation A58 together with the changes to Policy E1 and their associated text in the reasoned justification, provides a clear basis for the provision of a new major strategic site which would be available and treated as suitable for new waste management development on a site currently in the Green Belt.

3.9 The Parish Council considers that such a use on this site would be inappropriate for the following reasons. The site would almost directly adjoin the new housing site at A43 and would be a potential “bad neighbour development”. The open ended nature of the policy which appears to provide no limit on the extent of development depending on “the borough’s needs” adds to the growing sense of alarm that the policy ground is being prepared for industrial or waste use which could have serious environmental consequences for the Parish and its community. The existence of the current warehouse on the site does not justify the intensification of industrial uses on a site of the size proposed in this rural location. Waste management uses would be particularly unwelcome. Other concerns are the lack of specific controls on traffic generation, ensuring that any such development is contingent on appropriate highway improvements (such as the new slip roads to the A3) and to ensure that heavy vehicles associated with the development are not able to access the rural road network.

3.10 If, contrary to the Parish Council’s objection, such an allocation was to proceed to adoption, the need for the protection of the landscape and countryside and local residential amenity would mean that there must be limits on height and footprint of buildings, the scale and nature of circulation and parking areas (especially HGV parking) and other infrastructure, the use of materials, advertising and signage. Lighting would need to be controlled, to prevent intrusive all night floodlighting of the site. Such is the importance of these factors that they should be written into the policy for this site allocation.

3.11 The location for a waste management facility in the countryside ought to be subject to a full sequential site analysis and suitable locations should be identified in the plan making process in an open and transparent way, considering alternative sites higher up the sequential hierarchy, rather than being designated under the guise of a standard industrial allocation.
3.12 The allocation policy should be the subject of a full sequential site assessment in accordance with the Waste Local Plan. Such facilities should be planned on a county wide basis, given their strategic importance and the County level waste authority’s responsibilities.

3.13 If, contrary to the Parish Council’s in principle objection, the allocation was to proceed to adoption, they would promote a modification to specifically rule out waste management, especially any open air or unenclosed waste management, irrespective of whether or not such waste management was to fall within Use Classes B1(c), B2 or B8. The Policy should specifically state that notwithstanding the Use Classes Order 1987, waste management uses shall be considered unsuitable uses on the A58 site and in any case, no such use shall take place on the site without specific grant of planning permission.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1327</th>
<th>Respondent: 15293793 / Anita Norman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POLICY A58 – LAND AROUND BURNT COMMON WAREHOUSE LONDON ROAD SEND

The proposal for commercial/industrial development on this site is contrary to Green Belt policy.

There are a number of suitable vacant sites and buildings in Slyfield and Guildford and there is no proven need to develop this essentially farmland site.

The previous development proposal for this site in the 2014 Draft Local Plan was eventually deleted from that plan due to the objections raised. In the 2016 Draft Local Plan the proposal was re-introduced for a MAXIMUM development of 7000m², however in the current 2017 Draft Local Plan the proposal is for a MINIMUM of 7,000m² which could lead to a vast overdevelopment of the site with resulting negative impact on the quality of the surrounding area and the inevitable increase in traffic problems, particularly when considered with the many local developments currently being put forward in the 2017 Draft Local Plan and as stated above.

The proposed development would be detrimental to the existing residential properties along this section of the London Road by way of increased noise, traffic, environmental and visual impact, including the potential for parked lorries and trailers when arriving at the site ‘out of hours’.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4412</th>
<th>Respondent: 15300385 / Mark Harding</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The previous development proposal for this site in the 2014 Draft Local Plan was eventually deleted from that plan due to the objections raised. In the 2016 Draft Local Plan the proposal was re-introduced for a MAXIMUM development of 7000m², however in the current 2017 Draft Local Plan the proposal is for a MINIMUM of 7,000m² which could lead to a vast overdevelopment of the site with resulting negative impact on the quality of the surrounding area and the inevitable increase in traffic problems, particularly when considered with the many local developments currently being put forward in the 2017 Draft Local Plan and as stated above.

The proposed development would be detrimental to the existing residential properties along this section of the London Road by way of increased noise, traffic, environmental and visual impact, including the potential for parked lorries and trailers when arriving at the site ‘out of hours’.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3312  **Respondent:** 15301953 / A Smithers  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because it was deleted from the 2014 draft because of previous objections and there is no requirement in the area for a minimum of 7,000 sq m of industrial warehousing. It will impact the small surrounding roads, and the traffic will be further gridlocked. The Ripley exit off the A3 in both directions is already dangerous with cars speeding through the village to cut through Send and Ripley. There is no demand for industrial warehousing in this area and there are warehouses in Slyfield Green which are purpose built and empty. It will erode the Green Belt further and join up Ripley and Send villages unnecessarily.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2687  **Respondent:** 15303457 / Hannah Green  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:
• It seems unfair to resurrect this idea given all the previous objections resulting in it being deleted from the 2014 plan
• With the increased uncertainty caused by Brexit there is an anticipated decline in demand for industrial land in the South East
• The industrial estate in Slyfield and in other parts of the borough have spare sites and excess capacity
• The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not the proposed huge allocation of over 10 hectares at Send - and in the Green Belt
• Once again, the impact on congestion will be significant

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1777  **Respondent:** 15312577 / Freda Ward  **Agent:**
I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
- The word "minimum" is a change from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock - this is a very significant issue.
- It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3250  Respondent: 15312769 / Norah Johnson  Agent:

The inclusion of site A58 Burnt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

*The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, … (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]”*

*The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”*

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3471  Respondent: 15312961 / Alison Johnson  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the amendments to the Local Plan policy A58 changes at Burnt Common, London Road.

1. It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of previous objections.
2. The word 'minimum' is a change from the previous 'maximum' in the 2016 plan and there has been a decline in demand for industrial land.
3. Slyfield has empty sites and industrial units and therefore further provision destroying Green Belt is unnecessary.
4. The effect on the small country roads, especially through Clandon and Send will cause problems for lorries.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2178  Respondent: 15320673 / Rosie Beauvais  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A58 at Burnt Common for the following:

This proposal was removed from the 2014 planning draft because of the objections made at the time.

Sadly it has returned and has changed from a 'maximum' of 7000sq m to a 'minimum' of 7000sq m, there are empty sites on the established Slyfield Industrial site which surely support the evidence that there is a decline in the demand for industrial land.

If the new site is built once again the resulting traffic will cause unacceptable levels of gridlock which will increase pollution and noise.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3538  Respondent: 15320737 / Steven Brown  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 change at Burnt Common - now a minimum of 7,000 sq m of industrial or warehousing

The word 'minimum' has been changed from ‘maximum’ in the 2016 plan. There are more appropriate alternative locations rather than using green belt land for industrial and warehouse development. The impact on local roads from increased traffic will be huge.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp172/2384  Respondent: 15324833 / Ann Gifford  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Slyfield and Guildford still have industrial sites available so there is no need to build on the Green Belt.

The impact on local roads will cause traffic gridlock.

I hope that the council will reconsider these plans and not disregard the objections of so many people.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2045  Respondent: 15326369 / J D W Todd  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A58.

Now a new allocation for a minimum of 7,000 sq m of industrial or warehousing.

I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:

1) It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously. The word minimum is a change from the previous maximum in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land.

2) There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

3) The impact on small surrounding roads will create more traffic.

4) It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4350  Respondent: 15326657 / Janet Davie  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land around Burnt Common Warehouse (site no. A58)
• **Outside current development boundary:** I OBJECT since this development lies outside the existing development outline of the village. It represents ribbon development, loss of green belt land, and creeping development between Send and Guildford.

• **Use of Green Belt land:** I OBJECT because there are no special or exceptional circumstances identified which justify removal of the Green Belt

• **Industrial use:** I OBJECT to the proposed industrial development of a minimum of 7,000 sq. m at Garlick’s Arch because there is insufficient justification contained within the draft Local Plan plus it is not a sustainable development. It is removed from the major population centres in Guildford and Woking necessitating a large increase in public transport services and/or major additional traffic movements for staff travel and business logistics. If there is a need for 7,000+ sq. m of industrial space within the Borough it should be located at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available, where transport link upgrades are already under way, and where it would be largely welcomed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1678  **Respondent:** 15329345 / Robin Hurst  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Land at Burnt Common London Road, policy A58

- The exit heading North from the A3 is one of the most dangerous exists, and you want to intentionally put more heavy goods traffic through it.
- The impact on the surrounding roads will be immense and cause traffic gridlock.
- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of the amount of objections made.
- The word “minimum” is changed to the previous maximum in the 2016 plan.
- There is no need to build more industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the greenbelt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2293  **Respondent:** 15329345 / Robin Hurst  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Land at Burnt Common London Road, policy A58

- The exit heading North from the A3 is one of the most dangerous exists, and you want to intentionally put more heavy goods traffic through it.
- The impact on the surrounding roads will be immense and cause traffic gridlock.
- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of the amount of objections made.
- The word “minimum” is changed to the previous maximum in the 2016 plan.
- There is no need to build more industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the greenbelt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3264</th>
<th>Respondent: 15341441 / Gillian Thorpe</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this proposal was deleted from the 2014 draft. There has been a decline for industrial land especially after Brexit. Slyfield is an adequate industrial site for the area. There are plenty of unused office buildings in Guildford. Why wreck the greenbelt to add to the glut. The impact of addition traffic and especially large lorries will cause considerable traffic jams in Send and of course the A3 which already cannot cope in the rush hours. The impact on the narrow lanes such as Vicarage Lane, Potter's Lane and Send Hill will be hire delusional for local residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1552</th>
<th>Respondent: 15341985 / William Walker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of previous objections. There is no proven reason to have more industrial and Warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt, when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units. This amounts to a huge over allocation of industrial land, in the middle of the Green Belt, given the current decline in demand for such industrial premises within the Guildford area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1593</th>
<th>Respondent: 15342465 / Evelyn Walker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of previous objections. There is no proven reason to have more industrial and Warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt, when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units. This amounts to a huge over allocation of industrial land, in the middle of the Green Belt, given the current decline in demand for such industrial premises within the Guildford area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3997</th>
<th>Respondent: 15348481 / Donna Styles</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attended documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2909  Respondent: 15350881 / Mark Hewson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

I object to Land at Burnt Common London Road being allocated for 7000sq metres of industrial space Policy A58. This is unnecessary as there it would be irresponsible to future generations to develop green belt land where there are many other sites which could be used for industrial space. The Send area is being allocated a disproportionate amount of development which will impact the small roads and lead to the area becoming a cut through to the A3. The word minimum has been changed from the previous maximum which opens up the site to future further development beyond what is in the Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attended documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2693  Respondent: 15356513 / Anthony Gatford  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

3) I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of previous objections. There is no proven reason to have more industrial and Warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt, when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units. This amounts to a huge over allocation of industrial land, in the middle of the Green Belt, given the current decline in demand for such industrial premises within the Guildford area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attended documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2697  Respondent: 15356833 / Carolyn Gatford  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

3) I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:
I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of previous objections. There is no proven reason to have more industrial and Warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt, when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units. This amounts to a huge over allocation of industrial land, in the middle of the Green Belt, given the current decline in demand for such industrial premises within the Guildford area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1071  Respondent: 15358625 / Ron Best  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 which relates to development at Burnt Common which was deleted in 2014 because the objections made at the time were acknowledged. Its re-appearance in 2016 included up to 7000 sq m of industrial or warehousing use. This now appears as a minimum, which opens the way to further industrial development in the future. This will exacerbate all the negative impacts on infrastructure and the environment to which I have objected previously.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2035  Respondent: 15366209 / Corinne Singleton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A58 - Burnt Common

My objections are that this was deleted from the 2014 Draft - why have you now resurrected it and added it to the revised proposal?

1. There has been a decline for the need of industrial land - many office buildings and industrial lands stand derelict why build more?

2. Slyfield and Guildford have empty sites and industrial units - USE THESE FIRST. There is no need to build an industrial or warehouse unit in the middle of the Green Belt.

3. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

4. The impact on narrow surrounding country lanes will create traffic gridlock

5. As stated before it will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**Comment ID:** pslp172/2799  **Respondent:** 15366721 / Sylvia Newton  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

New Policy A58 I object. The most unsuitable policy for this area. As already it is impossible to leave the road we live in and environmentally a disaster. What about further up the A3 where the slip road is already partially in existence. With no interference [illegible word x2] homes. Possibility all round for purpose of traffic [illegible word].

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4667  **Respondent:** 15368993 / Tessa Spink  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word "minimum" is a change from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that "there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented."
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2339  Respondent: 15373153 / C R Woodland  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common which is now a new allocation for a minimum of 7.000 sqm of industrial or warehousing. Surely this is a mistake and the word should be 'maximum', as in the 2016 plan. Since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. Slyfield and Guildford have empty units and site A45 is totally unsuitable for a large industrial estate. I continue to support in principle the idea of a new junction with access to and from the A3 in both directions somewhere between Burpham and Burnt Common, however the correct place for this is near to site A25 Gosden Hill Farm, using both sides of the London Road dual carriageway to access the new junction from Burnt Common roundabout.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4745  Respondent: 15379969 / Teresa Britton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

C.iii. Policy A58 Burnt Common – My Objections

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a
completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4358</th>
<th>Respondent: 15386017 / Gareth Sinnett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
3. There are already empty sites and units at Slyfield and Guildford and therefore no need to build new industrial and warehouse developments in our area. I can only envisage these will end up being empty too.
4. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand for industrial land for the whole borough to 3.9 hectares. This policy is a huge allocation of 10 hectares for Send alone. Totally unacceptable.
5. The small roads around this area are already often at gridlock. This can only make the problem worse.
6. The merging of existing villages (which will occur) defeats the purpose of the Green Belt.

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned in policy 4.423a and does not allow for full and proper consultation. This is unacceptable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4424  Respondent: 15388673 / Bruce Stewart  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potentially newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3141  Respondent: 15389025 / Keith Cogan  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A58 Land at Bunt Common – 7000sq.m of industrial bldg.

- Previously deleted in response to objections the proposal is now unlimited with a MIN 7000sqm!?
- The location is unsuitable, where is evidence of local demand for these units?
- This completely contravenes the very idea and intent of green belt to stop is joining up villages, along with the others it will destroy the essence of these villages..

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4727  Respondent: 15398657 / Kim Roberts  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

15. I object to the potential impact of para 4.4.23a on Burnt Common with its over allocation of industrial zoning is subterfuge for a waste management facility which is a dishonest and underhand approach to planning and proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1247</th>
<th>Respondent: 15406145 / Paul Moore</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1662</th>
<th>Respondent: 15419489 / Janet Drew</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object to Local Plan Policy A58 because there is no need to build on Green Belt land when there is clearly industrial space available in the local area. The road and traffic situation in the area of the proposed development is already congested and the increase in HGV traffic will only cause further problems. I also object to the infilling of areas between villages via the use of Green Belt land.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2451</th>
<th>Respondent: 15425665 / East Clandon Parish Council (Alyson Blackwell)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>We object to site A58 Burntcommon, which has now become a ‘Strategic Employment Site’. The overall burden on Send (and West Clandon) of the minimum of 7000sq m of industrial space (i.e. could be much larger) is greater than the now deleted up-to 7000 sq m from the neighbouring site A43 Garlick’s Arch. This is a net gain in traffic and congestion in this area. The proposed insetting of Send Business Park from the Green Belt indicates GBC’s increased emphasis and ambition for growth of this village.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2998</th>
<th>Respondent: 15426305 / I C Dean</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: pslp172/3822</td>
<td>Respondent: 15429985 / Jennifer Slade</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy A58 Burnt Common – Objections</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously. The Plan calls for a minimum of 7000sq. m (previously in the 2016 Plan a maximum figure) but will take 9.26 hectares out of the green belt. There is no proper justification given for taking the additional land.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The evidence base does not support this scale of additional industrial space and the justification for placing it in the green belt is not made out. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a demand for about 4 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Burnt Common in the green belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A far better use of land would be to redevelop some of the inadequate and rather decrepit industrial premises not encroach on the green belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The reference to waste management facilities mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and should not be so casually included for this site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The A247 through West Clandon and Send is likely to experience large volumes of additional traffic including heavy vehicles generated by the proposed light industry, storage, distribution and waste management activities at Burnt Common. There is also the likelihood of commercial vehicle traffic between Slyfield and Burnt Common particularly when the Clay Lane access is built which will impact the same road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2274</th>
<th>Respondent: 15432705 / Gordon Bennett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object to Policy A58 change - Land at Burnt Common, London Road which was deleted from the 2014 draft Plan, due to the large number of objections. There is no proven demand now or in the future for additional industrial capacity. It would therefore appear that GBC is presuming that a new A3 junction will be built sometime in the future at Send and justify this excessive industrial development within a Green Belt residential/rural area. The existing industrial areas in Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units and the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for the whole of Guildford Borough - not the excessive allocation of 10 hectares in Send alone within the Green Belt which will cause major traffic gridlock in the surrounding roads and join up existing villages - again defeating the Green Belt. It is also noted that the word &quot;maximum&quot; in the 2016 Plan has, very significantly, been changed to &quot;minimum&quot;. The existing roads cannot service such a development and the weight of commercial vehicles. This proposed industrial development on green belt is totally unacceptable and unnecessary.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2274</th>
<th>Respondent: 15432705 / Gordon Bennett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2277  Respondent: 15432705 / Gordon Bennett  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch)

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

- The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm,… (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]”
- The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2721  Respondent: 15433153 / Helen Green  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

- It seems unfair to resurrect this idea given all the previous objections resulting in it being deleted from the 2014 plan
- With the increased uncertainty caused by Brexit there is an anticipated decline in demand for industrial land in the South East
- The industrial estate in Slyfield and in other parts of the borough have spare sites and excess capacity
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not the proposed huge allocation of over 10 hectares at Send - and in the Green Belt
- Once again, the impact on congestion will be significant

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

- It seems unfair to resurrect this idea given all the previous objections resulting in it being deleted from the 2014 plan
- With the increased uncertainty caused by Brexit there is an anticipated decline in demand for industrial land in the South East
- The industrial estate in Slyfield and in other parts of the borough have spare sites and excess capacity
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not the proposed huge allocation of over 10 hectares at Send - and in the Green Belt
- Once again, the impact on congestion will be significant

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to Policy A58, Land at Burnt Common, London Road. This was previously deleted from 2014 draft because of all previous objections made but has now been included again with a change in wording from ‘up to 7000sqm’ to ‘a minimum of 7000sqm. This potentially opens up this site to unlimited development (the site is over 90,000sqm) when there is no justification for industrial development in the borough, especially on green belt land. This site will also create even more traffic gridlock for Send

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

1. The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, … (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]”
2. The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.
Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1561  Respondent: 15434433 / James Collins  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4336  Respondent: 15438049 / David A Sprigings  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

20.1 object to site allocation A58 Land around Burnt Common warehouse, London Road, Send as there is no justification for changing the required industrial/warehousing space (Bic, B2 & 138) from a maximum of 7000 sq mt at A43 Garlick's Arch in the 2016 plan to a minimum of 7000 sq mt at A58 Burnt Common in the 2017 plan when the TOTAL requirement for Industrial Land (Bic, B2 & B8) has fallen from a range of 4.7 to 5.3 ha in the 2016 plan to a range of 3.7 to 4.1 ha in the 2017 plan (Policy S2: Planning for the borough - our spatial development strategy, point (1) page 30 and Policy E1:Meeting employment needs, table under point (1) page 71), a reduction of more than 20%.

21. I object to site allocation A58 Land around Burnt Common warehouse, London Road, Send as it appears to be a means of trying to establish this site allocation as being for future use for Waste Management activities which would be totally unsuitable for this area with many houses and families in the area. This is because "POLICY E1: Meeting employment needs (8) on page 71 is "When developed, new employment land at Burnt Common, together with the existing employment floorspace, will be treated as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site" and page 77 4.4.23a "plus 4.4.23a on page 77 (all in red): "Development involving waste management facilities may be appropriate and will be directed to the Industrial Strategic Employment Sites ...... Some waste management activities fall within the industrial classes in the Use Classes Order and can be considered to be a Bic, B2 or B8 use. This is particularly the case given the increased move towards enclosing waste management activities in purpose-designed buildings". This is totally unjustified for inclusion in site allocation A58. I object to any possible use of site allocation A58 for Waste Management activities as residents are not provided with sufficient information for a full and proper Public Consultation under the terms of the Town & Country Planning Act.

22. I object to any possible future use of site allocation A58 Land around Burnt Common warehouse, London Road, Send for possible Waste Management activities as these would be totally unsuitable for the site and the local area. Any further need for Waste Management should be included in site allocation A24 Slyfield Area Regeneration Project which already
includes Allocations (4) New council waste management depot (relocated on site), and (5) New or enhanced waste management facilities (including a waste transfer station and a community recycling centre). As Key Consideration (2) of A24 shows, 1/ha of the site is allocated for Waste Management purposes in the Development Plan for the area (under Policy WD2 of the SWP).

23. I object to site allocations A35 Wisley Airfield, A43 Garlick's Arch and A58 Land around Burnt Common as the scheduled delivery of the important local transport infrastructure developments is unjustifiably late in the process, eg: - A43 Garlick's Arch is stated to be available in the first five years of the plan with 400 homes (0) and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots proposed: "There is no available alternative site that can provide Travelling Showpeople plots in the first five years of the plan to meet need", 2017 Sustainability Appraisal. - A58 Land around Burnt Common warehouse, London Road, Send: Land Availability Assessment (2017 Addendum) page 15: "There is a realistic prospect that development will be delivered within the first five years of the Local Plan"; page 16 "Timescale 0-5 years". - SRN 9 and SRN 10, new A3/A247 junctions are stated to be scheduled during the period 2021 to 2027. (Guildford Borough Transport Strategy 2017 page 22).

LRN7 Interventions to address potential highway performance issues resulting from the development at former Wisley Airfield site, including various mitigation schemes to address issues affecting Ripley High Street, A3 Ockham Interchange and M25/A3 Junction 10, are stated to be scheduled for likely delivery during the period 2021 to 2033. (Guildford Borough Transport Strategy 2017 page 23). It seems ridiculous that the Local Plan is based on developments A43 and A58 taking place or at least begun BEFORE the required improvements to major local transport networks. Unless the major road network improvements take place before the site developments, the Ripley/Send Marsh/Burnt Common/Send/Clandon area will be subject to severe traffic congestion arising from the site developments with very limited access for the vast number of heavy vehicle journeys that will be required which will cause an absolute nightmare for traffic in these villages. It will make Portsmouth Road even more dangerous than it is already at its various junctions.

The addition of new A3/A247 junctions (A43a; SRN9, SRN10) will not help the area of these villages as it will encourage far more traffic to join/leave from the A3 via the A247 meaning much more traffic through Clandon, with its very narrow bends on the A247, and Send in particular, the latter making it more dangerous for pupils, parents and staff at Send Primary School and also more dangerous for both patients and staff at The Villages Medical Centre, as well as local residents and businesses in Send.

Although the draft Local Plan includes reference to the Highways England (HE) Proposed M25/A3 Junction 10 improvement it takes no account of the HE intention to close off access from the A3 northbound onto Wisley Lane, which includes access to RHS Wisley. The HE plan is to only have access to Wisley Lane from a slip road running parallel to A3 northbound, its only access being from the Ockham Interchange (Ockham/Ripley roundabout) which will only be accessible from the southbound A3, with NO ACCESS FROM THE NORTHBOUND A3. Although HE say that there will be signs on the northbound A3 advising drivers to go to the M25 junction roundabout, turn around and leave the A3 southbound at Ockham Interchange for Wisley/RHS Wisley, human nature being what it is most such drivers will leave the A3 northbound at London Road B2215 and drive through Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley to get to Ockham Interchange for access to RHS Wisley. So every time an event takes place at RHS Wisley we can expect even worse traffic congestion through Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley which makes the building of 400 homes at Garlick's Arch on Portsmouth Road even less appropriate, and Travelling Showpeople with heavy vehicles for fairground equipment an even bigger mistake. A43 Garlick's Arch should be removed from the Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site.

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. This was deleted from the 2014 draft plan because of all the objections previously made – therefore why has it been included again?
2. There has been a decline in demand for industrial land since the previous draft plan but the 2016 version uses the word ‘maximum’ a change from ‘minimum’ within it – this does not make sense.
3. There are already empty sites and units at Slyfield and Guildford and therefore no need to build new industrial and warehouse developments in our area. I can only envisage these will end up being empty too.
4. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand for industrial land for the whole borough to 3.9 hectares. This policy is a huge allocation of 10 hectares for Send alone. Totally unacceptable.
5. The small roads around this area are already often at gridlock. This can only make the problem worse.
6. The merging of existing villages (which will occur) defeats the purpose of the Green Belt.

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned in policy 4.423a and does not allow for full and proper consultation. This is unacceptable

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/316  Respondent: 15442785 / Tammy Hoar  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because

1. There has been a decline in demand for Industrial land and there are empty sites in the area.
2. Impact on traffic at the Burnt Common roundabout will be enormous.
3. Further contempt for the Green Belt by GBC.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/319  Respondent: 15446561 / Peter Hoar  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because

1. There has been a decline in demand for Industrial land and there are empty sites in the area.
2. Impact on traffic at the Burnt Common roundabout will be enormous.
3. Further contempt for the Green Belt by GBC.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp172/684  
Respondent: 15446689 / James Eric Barr  
Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common, London Road because it was deleted from the 2014 draft because of the amount of objections, the word "minimum" is a change from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land, there is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units, the proposal is a huge over allocation of 10 hectares although the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough, even more traffic would be using small surrounding roads which can't cope with present traffic volumes. Besides causing gridlock all this overdevelopment will obviously contribute to a worsening of air pollution.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3100  
Respondent: 15446753 / David Boyce  
Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch)

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, … (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]”

The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3104  
Respondent: 15446753 / David Boyce  
Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)
The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.4.23a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4664  Respondent: 15448321 / Nicole Mapplebeck  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.
15. I object to the potential impact of para 4.4.23a on Burnt Common with its over allocation of industrial zoning is subterfuge for a waste management facility which is a dishonest and underhand approach to planning and proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:


Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3670  **Respondent:** 15448897 / Ruth Brothwell  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A58 at Burnt Common - this was deleted from an earlier draft (in 2014) because of all the objections made. Why is it suddenly back on the agenda?

There has been a decline in the demand for industrial land since the first proposal - yet I note that what was proposed as a maximum number in the original plan is now a minimum number!! Reduction in need was demonstrates in the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment - we do not need this huge over allocation of land in our Green Belt.

There are empty sites and industrial units at both Slyfield and Guildford which surely need filling before any further industrial expansion is proposed? I strongly wish our villages to remain in the Green Belt and do not believe there is a need to ruin the area by increasing the industrial property available.

As stated above this proposal aims to link up two distinct village areas which is against the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1939  **Respondent:** 15461217 / S. Gilby  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the change to Policy A 58 Land at Burnt Common as it now has a **minimum** allocation of 7000 sq m of industrial or warehouse development. Th.ere is no need for this development in the middle of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1580  **Respondent:** 15461761 / K.J. Pullen  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This policy was deleted from the 2014 draft, because of the number of objections and it is noted that since then you not only reinstated the plan in 2016, despite a turn down in demand for industrial land and you have replaced the word
'maximum' with 'minimum'? The '2017 Employment Land Need Assessment' shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough. The industrial and warehouse areas at 'Slyfield' and 'Guildford' have empty sites and industrial units, so your enormous over allocation of 10 hectares at Send, in the green Belt is unfathomable. Once again the impact on local roads will cause one mass of clogged carriageways and overdevelopment will completely defeat the purpose of the 'Green Belt'.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/165  Respondent: 15463009 / P M Proctor  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site A58 Burnt Common
I object to the change which includes this new aspect of industrial development which may involve Waste Management Facilities. It would be totally unsuited to this area and would involve very considerable additional heavy traffic on the local, overloaded, roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2762  Respondent: 15463009 / P M Proctor  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the change which includes this new aspect of industrial development which may involve Waste Management Facilities. It would be totally unsuited to this area and would involve very considerable additional heavy traffic on the local, overloaded, roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3659  Respondent: 15468705 / Pauline East  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because it was previously deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made at the time and there is no need to build an industrial site in the middle of Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units. Such a development will further impact the surrounding roads and environment, creating traffic congestion, noise and pollution issues.
I object to Policy A58 at Burnt common because;
- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all of the previous objections so I cannot understand why it has now been included again.
- Industrial and warehousing could not be further from the idea of protected greenbelt land, Slyfield would be the obvious choice for such purposes as it already have the infrastructure and a grouping of similar businesses. This is not a good reason to irrevocably damage our Green Belt.
- I would like to leave my house in the future to my children and I want it to be surrounded by Green Belt land as it is now including all the nature that encompasses
- The word 'minimum' is a change from the previous 'maximum' in the 2016 plan and since that point there has been a decline in the demand for such industrial land.
- The 2017 Employment land Need assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares, rather than the massively inflated 10 hectares in send on the green belt.
- It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

a) It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously.

b) Why not develop Slyfield where there are empty industrial units rather than build on Green Belt?

c) I understand that the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not an over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
Policy A58 Land at Burnt common, London Road.
I object to this proposal of minimum 7,000 sqm floor space.

a) No justification of change of criteria of floor space from "maximum to minimum". This will encourage future on-going development.

b) Slyfield and Guildford still have capacity - no need or demand identified to build industrial development on Green Belt land.

c) 2017 Employment Land Needs Assessment shows a reduction in demand, NOT an increase.

d) More traffic chaos, gridlock and pollution.

I also wish to state that I strongly object to the overall development proposals for Send Village. The plans are very disproportionate compared with other areas in the Guildford borough - some of which have been exempted in the updated version of the plan due to Green Belt and Natural Beauty. Send is also Green Belt and has several areas of Natural Beauty. Much of these plans will seriously impact on the lives of the residents, create traffic chaos and high pollution levels. Also, given the proposed A3 North/South double link interchange at Clandon Road, Send will become a suburb of Guildford. Guildford Council has ignored the views of thousands of people - residents, working people, environmentalists and other interested parties who have taken the time to write and express their views.

WHERE IS DEMOCRACY??

The Council planners should sit down with our Parish Council, Community leaders, residents and interested parties to work together to produce a fair and acceptable plan for Send - NOT impose this damaging plan that will significantly change our Village forever.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline
developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/322  **Respondent:** 15477729 / Julia Hoar  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because

1. There has been a decline in demand for Industrial land and there are empty sites in the area.
2. Impact on traffic at the Burnt Common roundabout will be enormous.
3. Further contempt for the Green Belt by GBC.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2027  **Respondent:** 15478209 / Sally Daboo  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Burnt Common strategic industrial employment site for light industry, storage and distribution activities. It is to be designated an Industrial Strategic Employment Site which means that it is a preferred site for industrial development including waste management facilities. The site is 9ha which it is stated allows for considerable future expansion. This will generate large amounts of traffic including heavy vehicles on the A247.

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site.
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented”.
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units. This is particularly wasteful at a time when our economy is under stress and every effort should be made to be efficient.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space”.
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4472  Respondent: 15483713 / Claire Walker  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/950  Respondent:  15485601 / Tim Jewers  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

SITE A58 BURNT COMMON
This increase of industrial floor space from 7000 sq m to an unspecified amount and the addition potential for a Waste Management Facility at this site does not provide local residents full and proper consultation rights.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/951  Respondent:  15485601 / Tim Jewers  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

SITE A58 BURNT COMMON
This increase of industrial floor space from 7000 sq m to an unspecified amount and the addition potential for a Waste Management Facility at this site does not provide local residents full and proper consultation rights.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2161  Respondent:  15486017 / Neil Higgins  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:
• It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
• The word "minimum" is a change from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land
• There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
• The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
• The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
• It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3272  Respondent: 15495873 / Gerard Duvé  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A58 – Land around Burnt Common Warehouse
I object to this site being included as well as Garlicks Arch.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3573  Respondent: 15502433 / Jill Murphy  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I Object to POLICY A58 at BURNT COMMON because:

It was deleted in the 2014 plan because of so many objections were made.

There is no need to build industrial or warehousing development IN THE MIDDLE OF THE PRECIOUS GREEN BELT when Slyfield and Guildford have EMPTY sites and industrial units.

The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a REDUCTION in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial use in the whole Borough NOT a huge allocation of 10 hectares at SEND IN THE GREEN BELT.

The resultant GRIDLOCK in the already very congested local roads from car and heavy transport would be a disaster for local Send residents.

AGAIN this will join up local villages thus defeating the object of our precious Green Belt.

The WORD MINIMUM has been craftily changed from the previous MAXIMUM in the 2016 plan and since then there has been a large decline in demand for industrial land.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1948  Respondent: 15503457 / Patrick Lea  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Furthermore I object to policy A58 at Burnt Common because it was deleted from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made at the time and there would seem to be no justification for building a new industrial/warehouse development when there are empty sites at Slyfield and Guildford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3638  Respondent: 15505377 / Simon Wright  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 Burnt Common due to the following points:

There is no requirement for new industrial or warehouse space as there is availability at Slyfield and Guildford Industrial estates, developing in this way is pure stupidity and is just building for the sake of it.

Additionally, this site is in the Green Belt, there are no exceptional circumstances to justify development here.

According to the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment there is a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land in the whole borough. Why is there a huge allocation of 10 hectares in Send? This policy has not been thought through at all.

Generally transport evidence for this policy is incomplete and unreliable. What would happen in reality would be serious accidents, major traffic jams twice a day and therefore excessive pollution.

Any extra traffic would cause traffic chaos in the local area with its small roads, adding commercial vehicles to this would be completely unsustainable.

This site was deleted from the 2014 Local Plan due to previous objections, why has it returned?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4553  Respondent: 15506401 / Alicia Robinson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site.

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357 sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607 sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750 sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357 sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357 sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT TO A58 at Burnt Common because: this site was deleted from the 2014 Local Plan due to objections, yet put back into the 2016 Plan, this current proposal looks too increase the development above the 7,000 square meters of warehouse or industrial units proposed in the 2016 Local Plan. There is currently no requirement for more industrial units. Guildford and Slyfield currently have empty sites and there is a decline in the demand for such sites, the 2017 employment land need assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for the whole borough, yet the council are proposing to destroy 10 hectares of Sends GREEN BELT for unnecessary units, putting even more pressure on the local roads and adding to the development along the A3 corridor totally against the GREEN BELT policy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4367  Respondent: 15570817 / Tom Edelsten  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), isLegally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4703 Respondent: 15571937 / S Bennell Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) is Sound? ( ) is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site.
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1702  Respondent: 15574497 / Ann Murray  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 Burnt Common, London Road because of the introduction of the word "minimum". This proposal was deleted from the Plan in 2014 because of the number of objections. The word "minimum" gives the council free rein to develop what it likes. Again this land is in the Green Belt. There are empty sites at Slyfield and Guildford. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land over the whole Borough - this would mean a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

Again, there would be increased traffic, adding to the problems already mentioned.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/247  Respondent: 15582817 / Karsten Kollov  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt common because;

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all of the previous objections so I cannot understand why it has now been included again

- Industrial and warehousing could not be further from the idea of protected greenbelt land, Slyfield would be the obvious choice for such purposes as it already have the infrastructure and a grouping of similar businesses. This is not a good reason to irrevocably damage our Green Belt.

- I would like to leave my house in the future to my children and I want it to be surrounded by Green Belt land as it is now including all the nature that encompasses

- The word 'minimum' is a change from the previous 'maximum' in the 2016 plan and since that point there has been a decline in the demand for such industrial land

- The 2017 Employment land Need assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares, rather than the massively inflated 10 hectares in send on the green belt

- It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I Object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common

because the changes from the previous proposals which were rejected, now make the potential development unlimited and is an indication of the perverse and irrational thinking of the council.

Why, when there is already an existing industrial and warehousing estate just 2 miles away with unused space and space to expand, would you build an unnecessary carbon copy.

There clearly needs to be a resolution, by discussion, as to how this piece of land created by the building of the Ripley Bypass can be brought into a useful asset for the community.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
6. The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

1.  a) The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, … (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]”
2.  b) The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

9. I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3453  Respondent: 15585409 / Vanessa Styles  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

1.  a) The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, … (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]”
2.  b) The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

1.  I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The inclusion of site A58 Burnt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

1. The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, … (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]”
2. The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the reference to a potential waste management facility at Burnt Common (site A58). No specific details have been published on this facility. However there can be no justification to sacrifice Green Belt land for such purposed whilst there are many alternative brown filed sites available in the borough.

I object to the removal of the limitation, previously set at 7,000 sq.m, to the industrial floorspace proposals at Burnt Common (site A58). The revised terminology of “at least 7,000 sq.m” is both ambiguous and potentially significantly damaging to the local environment.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3259  Respondent: 15591585 / John Thompson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

10. I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)
The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3124  Respondent: 15593665 / Thomas Cope  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:

• It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
• The word "minimum" is a change from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land
• There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
• The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt
• The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
• It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2111  Respondent: 15595553 / Carol Davis  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because there is a reduction in the demand for industrial land over the borough - this is shown by the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment and was noted in a recent application in Tithebarn Lane as the reason for conversion of industrial land to housing. It cannot work both ways.

- There are still empty sites at Slyfield and therefore there is no need to build more industrial development on the Green Belt
- The local area would not be able to cope with additional traffic potentially generated.
- This site was previously deleted from the 2014 draft due to objections

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3840  **Respondent:** 15604161 / Simon Greener  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
- The word "minimum" is a change from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
- It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4466  **Respondent:** 15608801 / Beth Fuller  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to
build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2702  Respondent: 15632289 / Claire Belton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A58 - on the grounds that it is Green-belt and development is not permitted. With vacant industrial property in the region, there is no need for further industrial space now or in the foreseeable future. I object to the change of wording to minimum'to replace maximum of 7000 sq m, as this is a deliberate act to open up our area to unlimited development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1854</th>
<th>Respondent: 15657057 / Frances Turner</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy A58 land at Burnt Common, London Rd</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to a new allocation of 7,000 sq m of industrial or warehousing which was deleted from the 2015 draft. I also object to the wording of the allocation: the 2016 &quot;maximum&quot; allocation of 7,000 sq m has now been changed to &quot;minimum&quot;. There is a surplus of industrial premises in the borough and the requirement for further industrial/warehousing has not been proven. The road infrastructure is inadequate and there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant development on the green belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4092</th>
<th>Respondent: 15705761 / David Jenner</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The inclusion of site A58 Burnt Common now proposed once again, removes the need for A43 Garlick's Arch, surely only one site is needed, especially as they are so close to one another.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4094</th>
<th>Respondent: 15705761 / David Jenner</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in the Green Belt site (Burnt Common A58) which is mentioned but does not allow for full and proper consultation.(More traffic on our road).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4578</th>
<th>Respondent: 15711265 / Jonathan Dowling</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

15. I object to the potential impact of para 4.4.23a on Burnt Common with its over allocation of industrial zoning is subterfuge for a waste management facility which is a dishonest and underhand approach to planning and proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Burnt Common strategic industrial employment site for light industry, storage and distribution activities. It is to be designated an Industrial Strategic Employment Site which means that it is a preferred site for industrial development including waste management facilities. The site is 9ha which it is stated allows for considerable future expansion. This will generate large amounts of traffic including heavy vehicles on the A247.

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4517  Respondent: 15714817 / Vicky Dowling  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/79  Respondent: 17133121 / Catherine Rose  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to the fact that a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a and does not allow for full and proper consultation
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/244  Respondent: 17148161 / Sally Hall  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because;

- Slyfield Green and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units, therefore there is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the green belt
- This was deleted from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
- The surrounding roads will become swiftly gridlocked as an immediate impact on the smaller roads
- Again the effect of joining up existing roads defeats the purpose of the Green Belt
- The wording has been changed from the previous ‘maximum’ to the word ‘minimum’ in the 2016 plan, however since 2016 there has been a decline in demand for industrial land
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to just 3.9 hectares for industrial lane for the whole borough, not a massive over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in a dedicated Green Belt area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/292  Respondent: 17158849 / Gwenda Wakefield  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

Slyfield and Guildford have empty sites and industrial units therefore there is no need to build industrial or warehouses development in our Green Belt.

The word minimum is a change from the previous word maximum in the 2016 plan and since then there has been less demand for industrial land.

It is shown in the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

It defeats the key purpose of Green Belt by joining Ripley and Send.

The additional traffic created will block up our local roads.

Due to all the previous objections it was deleted form the 2014 draft.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because it ignores all previous objections made about industrial land in this location and has been added once again to the proposal after being previously removed due to public objection. The plan has changed the requirements from Maximum to Minimum of 700sq m of industrial land and there is no evidence to support this area being desirable, or necessary, for industrial expansion especially when Slyfield and Guildford still have industrial sites which are not fully utilised. The impact of industrial usage like this on small surrounding roads will be highly significant and will, once again, join Send as a Super Village to the surrounding villages whilst having a damaging impact on the surrounding green belt areas.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to the policy A58 at burntcommon as it will destroy the area. There is absolutely no need for a minimum of 7,000 sqft of industrial/warehouse development in this area especially as there are plenty of similar developments in slyfield/Guildford that are empty. We live in the pathway and the traffic leading to burntcommon roundabout is ridiculous already adding this level of extra traffic accessing this site would completely gridlock our roads. This proposed site had already been deleted from the 2014 due to the high level of objection it is crazy that it is being re proposed now. Please do not spoil our beautiful villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to the policy A58 at burntcommon as it will destroy the area. There is absolutely no need for a minimum of 7,000 sqft of industrial/warehouse development in this area especially as there are plenty of similar developments in slyfield/Guildford that are empty. We live in the pathway and the traffic leading to burntcommon roundabout is ridiculous already adding this level of extra traffic accessing this site would completely gridlock our roads. This proposed site had already been deleted from the 2014 due to the high level of objection it is crazy that it is being re proposed now. Please do not spoil our beautiful villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/349</th>
<th>Respondent: 17161889 / Mark Gurden</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I wish to object very strongly to Policy A58, land at Burnt Common. This has previously been removed from the Local Plan because of the numerous objections, and to re-submit it with a minimum rather than a maximum amount of industrial place is ridiculous, especially given that the demand for such space has dropped and nearby established sites such as Slyfield have empty units.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is already far too much traffic in the Ripley/Send area and this will create so much more and will effectively join the 2 towns together, defeating one of the purposes of the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/356</th>
<th>Respondent: 17163361 / Victoria Marr</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The potential for a substantial increase in industrial floorspace from 7000 sq m to an unspecified amount at the site A58 Burnt Common does not provide local residents with enough information for a full and proper consultation given the ambiguity and lack of detail within the document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a and does not allow for full and proper consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/364</th>
<th>Respondent: 17163425 / Richard Turner</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy A58 – I object to Policy A58 as I don’t see a need for industrial development and/or warehousing. Slyfield and Guildford have many units and areas available so unclear on where the demand for this proposal comes from. There would again be further impact on local roads and again join up villages unnecessarily.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/390</th>
<th>Respondent: 17166241 / Eloise Knights</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land at Burn Common, London Road, Policy A58

I object to Policy A58 at Burn Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
- The word ‘minimum’ is a change from the previous ‘maximum’ in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in the demand for industrial land
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse developments in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
- It will join up the existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to Policy A58 at Burn Common because:

• It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
• The word ‘minimum’ is a change from the previous ‘maximum’ in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in the demand for industrial land
• There is no need to build industrial or warehouse developments in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
• The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt
• The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
• It will join up the existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/399  Respondent: 17168033 / Jacqueline Knights  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Burn Common, London Road, Policy A58

I object to Policy A58 at Burn Common because:

• It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
• The word ‘minimum’ is a change from the previous ‘maximum’ in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in the demand for industrial land
• There is no need to build industrial or warehouse developments in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
• The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt
• The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
• It will join up the existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/459  Respondent: 17174017 / Joanne Moxon  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Burn Common, London Road, Policy A58

I object to Policy A58 at Burn Common because:

It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously The word ‘minimum’ is a change from the previous ‘maximum’ in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in the demand for industrial land There is no need to build industrial or warehouse developments in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in
demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock It will join up the existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/503</th>
<th>Respondent: 17178049 / Cam Pulham</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see no demand for industrial units in this area as units are still unoccupied in the immediate vicinity and economic trends will keep it this way for the foreseeable future. Why is Slyfield not being considered as part of this plan? This is green belt land and should not be used for any purpose, least of all commercial use when there is no proven need. The traffic would lead to a significant increase in road movements in the area and will effectively join up local communities and the area will lose it’s identity.</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/506</th>
<th>Respondent: 17178113 / Laura Frankland</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A58 – Land at Burnt Common because it has previously been deleted due to all of the objections previously made. There is no need to build an industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt as there are still empty sites in other locations for this use. The impact on traffic will create issues in our village and it will lose its village feel!</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/543</th>
<th>Respondent: 17184417 / Donald Pedonis</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to policy A58 at burnt common because it is unnecessary and will seal conbation from Ripley through to Send distroying the Green Belt.</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to Policy A58 because:

It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of previous objections.

The ‘maximum’ in the 2016 draft has now become a ‘minimum’.

The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment indicates a demand for a total of 3.9 hectares for industrial land in Guildford Borough. Why allocate 10 hectares in Send Green Belt?

There are empty sites and industrial units in Slyfield.

The increase in traffic cannot be managed without gridlock.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
We object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common, London Road because it was deleted from the 2014 draft because of the amount of objections, the word "minimum" is a change from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land, there is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units, the proposal is a huge over allocation of 10 hectares although the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough, even more traffic would be using small surrounding roads which can't cope with present traffic volumes. Besides causing gridlock all this overdevelopment will obviously contribute to a worsening of air pollution.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

- There is absolutely no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt. There are empty sites remaining at Slyfield and Guildford.

- Because of all the objections made previously, this was deleted from the 2014 draft.

- The 2016 plan has changed the word "minimum" to "maximum" and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. In fact, the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough, NOT a huge over-allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

- The traffic, which is already too heavy, will be vastly increased.

- The existing villages will be joined up and the Green Belt lost.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/775  Respondent: 17205249 / Dorothy Ann Sprigings  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because: Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units, so there is no need to build industrial or warehouse space in the Green Belt. The allocation of 10 hectares of industrial land in Send Green Belt is unnecessary and totally disproportionate for the local area when the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand for industrial land for the whole borough to 3.9 hectares. There has been a decline in demand for industrial land since the 2016 plan, but the word 'maximum' has been changed to 'minimum' regarding the area. This ambiguity and lack of detail does not provide local residents with enough information for proper consultation. The potential for a Waste Management Facility at A58 Burnt Common is mentioned obscurely in 4.423a and does not allow for proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?  
Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/797  Respondent: 17206177 / Ian William Groden  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A58  
Objections

Why has the “up to” 7000 sq m of employment floorspace, which appears to have moved from Garlick’s Arch, been changed to “minimum of 7000 sq m with a potential for further industrial floorspace to meet borough needs”? I understand the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for Industrial land for the whole borough, not a huge over allocation of over 9 hectares potential development at Send in the Green Belt. The impact of substantial development on the surrounding roads, environment and life of the Residents would be serious and would virtually join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?  
Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/805  Respondent: 17206433 / Rosalie Hewitt  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site A58 Burnt Common

Section page number  Page 316 of 405  Document page number 1350
• This is a new inclusion of a 9-hectare site for a minimum of light industrial, general industrial, storage and distribution. This is ambiguous and lacks detail
• 6 Travelling show people plots with associated mixed use yards and large storage facilities for equipment which, arguably, would involve storage for fairground rides, with associated articulated lorries, transportation vehicles and permanent residential plots which is the designated formula for 1500-1999. This would be out of scale with the proposed development
• Potential for Waste Management facility briefly mentioned in Policy 4.23a with no proper consultation. The impact on local infrastructure would be immense

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/826   Respondent: 17207105 / Caroline Minter   Agent:
Document:   Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Burnt Common, London Road - I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because there is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/856   Respondent: 17210145 / Tim Crook   Agent:
Document:   Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- the potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common as briefly mentioned in policy 4.4.23a does not allow for full and proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1099   Respondent: 17241889 / John Hackney   Agent:
Document:   Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)
The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1196  Respondent: 17246593 / Mrs S. Almeida  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A58 at Burnt common because....

It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously the word Minimum is a change from the previous Maximum in the 2016 plan There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of green belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have plenty of sites and industrial units The lorries and excess traffic will turn our roads into main noisy access roads.

It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of GREEN BELT.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1204  Respondent: 17247169 / Ben Greaves  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the "required" industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick's Arch to be included.

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1267  Respondent: 17249217 / David L. Hall  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Policy A58 Land at Burnt Common, London Road.

This proposal to develop some 7000 Sq.m of Green Belt land for Light Industrial or Warehouse usage was removed from the 2014 proposal because of the vast number of objection. It has resurfaced and the original word Maximum which refers to the figure of 7000 in the 2016 proposal has been replaced by the word Minimum. This change leaves this area open to even further development at a later stage.

Further development here is totally unnecessary since both Slyfield and Guilford have empty sites and Industrial Units available.

The impact of this proposed development would be severe on the local road network and would cause potential ‘Gridlock’.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1259  Respondent: 17249601 / Penelope Moore  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1362  Respondent: 17256577 / Tina Makin  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A58.
I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:
• It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
• The word "minimum" is a change from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land
• There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
• The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt
• The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
• It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to Policy A58 as this policy was deleted from the previous draft plan of 2014 due to the number of objections received and its inclusion now seems like a cynical attempt to ignore past concerns with the plans. I especially object to the change from ‘maximum’ in the 2016 Local Plan to ‘minimum’ as this will lead to the development of far more industrial capacity than is supported by the 2017 Land Need Assessment survey that indicated that the whole Borough needs under 4 hectares of industrial land and this proposal is for at least 10 hectares of development at Send, when there is also underutilised industrial units in Slyfield and Guildford that should be the primary site for development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Burnt Common strategic industrial employment site for light industry, storage and distribution activities. It is to be designated an Industrial Strategic Employment Site which means that it is a preferred site for industrial development including waste management facilities. The site is 9ha which it is stated allows for considerable future expansion. This will generate large amounts of traffic including heavy vehicles on the A247.

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1648</th>
<th>Respondent: 17283457 / Trudy Hills</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A58 at Burnt common because;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all of the previous objections so I cannot understand why it has now been included again</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Industrial and warehousing could not be further from the idea of protected greenbelt land, Slyfield would be the obvious choice for such purposes as it already have the infrastructure and a grouping of similar businesses. This is not a good reason to irrevocably damage our Green Belt.

- I would like to leave my house in the future to my children and I want it to be surrounded by Green Belt land as it is now including all the nature that encompasses

- The word 'minimum' is a change from the previous 'maximum' in the 2016 plan and since that point there has been a decline in the demand for such industrial land

- The 2017 Employment land Need assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares, rather than the massively inflated 10 hectares in send on the green belt

- It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

- It seems unfair to resurrect this idea given all the previous objections resulting in it being deleted from the 2014 plan
- With the increased uncertainty caused by Brexit there is an anticipated decline in demand for industrial land in the South East
- The industrial estate in Slyfield and in other parts of the borough have spare sites and excess capacity
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not the proposed huge allocation of over 10 hectares at Send – and in the Green Belt
- Once again, the impact on congestion will be significant

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
- The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the
2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land

There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units

The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a REDUCTION in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the WHOLE BOROUGH, not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt

The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic GRIDLOCK

It will expose local residents to illegally high levels of air pollution

It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1770  Respondent: 17286657 / Kristine Good  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A58.

Now a new allocation for a minimum of 7,000 sq m of industrial or warehousing

I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:

• It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
• The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land
• There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
• The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt
• The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
• It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1811  Respondent: 17288289 / Ken Grainger  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:
It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the previous objections

The word "minimum" is a change from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan and since then there has been a decline in demand for industrial land.

There is definitely no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when both Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment clearly shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

The impact on small surrounding roads will create a more serious and unacceptable traffic gridlock.

It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1830  **Respondent:** 17288513 / Andrew Bedworth  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**Land at Burn Common, London Road, Policy A58**

I object to Policy A58 at Burn Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
- The word ‘minimum’ is a change from the previous ‘maximum’ in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in the demand for industrial land.
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse developments in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
- It will join up the existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1836  **Respondent:** 17288705 / Lesley Davies  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**SITE A58, BURNT COMMON**
Local residents have not had any consultation on this. To substantially increase the industrial space from 7000 sq ft to an unspecified amount gives residents little or no information and clarity. Also, the proposal for a waste management facility needs proper consultation with local residents.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1840  **Respondent:** 17288833 / Beverley Robson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
- The word "minimum" is a change from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
- It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1850  **Respondent:** 17289377 / Kathleen & Christopher Vernum  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We further object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common and is was deleted from the 2014 draft because of the previous objections. The word minimum is a change from the previous maximum in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for the industrial land. There is little need to build more industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand for the whole borough, with no need for a huge allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt. The surrounding roads will be gridlocked and will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1868  **Respondent:** 17289697 / Carolyn Sanson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We further object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common and is was deleted from the 2014 draft because of the previous objections. The word minimum is a change from the previous maximum in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for the industrial land. There is little need to build more industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand for the whole borough, with no need for a huge allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt. The surrounding roads will be gridlocked and will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I do not understand the need for 7000 sq. m. of industrial buildings or warehousing on this site while there are empty sites and warehousing in Slyfield and Guildford itself. Again this planning proposal is in the area of the Greenbelt and many of the roads around Send and Ripley are narrow and cannot accommodate large lorries or vans.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1886  Respondent: 17291329 / Charmian Leach  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:
- it was deleted from the 2014 draft due to the volume of objections.
- Slyfield and Guildford have vacant industrial space so why build more in the green belt?
- the word “minimum” is a fundamental change from the word “maximum” which was in the 2016 plan and since then there has been a drop in demand for industrial land as evidenced by the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment reducing demand to 3.9 hectares for the whole borough? Why then now try and allocate over 10 hectares of green belt to industrial land?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1889  Respondent: 17291361 / Ron Leach  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:
- it was deleted from the 2014 draft due to the volume of objections.
- Slyfield and Guildford have vacant industrial space so why build more in the green belt?
- the word “minimum” is a fundamental change from the word “maximum” which was in the 2016 plan and since then there has been a drop in demand for industrial land as evidenced by the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment reducing demand to 3.9 hectares for the whole borough? Why then now try and allocate over 10 hectares of green belt to industrial land?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1895</th>
<th>Respondent: 17291521 / Barbara Phillips</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I also object to Policy A58 relating to Land at Burnt Common, London Road on the following grounds:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Traffic in the area is already chaotic and the roads are constantly gridlocked with traffic - to create even more cars on the road in this area will only cause utter bedlam and no doubt more accidents. The infrastructure cannot cope with any more vehicles - in particular the larger vehicles used on an industrial or warehouse development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is no necessity for another industrial/warehouse development in a Green Belt area when there are enough industrial/warehouse facilities not being used locally outside of the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The village of Ripley and Send have a defining boundary and with this overdevelopment it will all merge into one, which goes against the purpose of the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1914</th>
<th>Respondent: 17291553 / James Hitchings</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1907</th>
<th>Respondent: 17291585 / John Phillips</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I also object to Policy A58 relating to Land at Burnt Common, London Road on the following grounds:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Traffic in the area is already chaotic and the roads are constantly gridlocked with traffic - to create even more cars on the road in this area will only cause utter bedlam and no doubt more accidents. The infrastructure cannot cope with any more vehicles - in particular the larger vehicles used on an industrial or warehouse development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is no necessity for another industrial/warehouse development in a Green Belt area when there are enough industrial/warehouse facilities not being used locally outside of the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• The village of Ripley and Send have a defining boundary and with this overdevelopment it will all merge into one, which goes against the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1911  Respondent: 17291617 / Matthew Phillips  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I also object to Policy A58 relating to Land at Burnt Common, London Road on the following grounds:

• Traffic in the area is already chaotic and the roads are constantly gridlocked with traffic - to create even more cars on the road in this area will only cause utter bedlam and no doubt more accidents. The infrastructure cannot cope with any more vehicles - in particular the larger vehicles used on an industrial or warehouse development.

• There is no necessity for another industrial/warehouse development in a Green Belt area when there are enough industrial/warehouse facilities not being used locally outside of the Green Belt.

• The village of Ripley and Send have a defining boundary and with this overdevelopment it will all merge into one, which goes against the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1915  Respondent: 17291649 / Ian Phillips  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I also object to Policy A58 relating to Land at Burnt Common, London Road on the following grounds:

• Traffic in the area is already chaotic and the roads are constantly gridlocked with traffic - to create even more cars on the road in this area will only cause utter bedlam and no doubt more accidents. The infrastructure cannot cope with any more vehicles - in particular the larger vehicles used on an industrial or warehouse development.

• There is no necessity for another industrial/warehouse development in a Green Belt area when there are enough industrial/warehouse facilities not being used locally outside of the Green Belt.

• The village of Ripley and Send have a defining boundary and with this overdevelopment it will all merge into one, which goes against the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch)

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

1. The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, … (site allocation A25) [than the Burnt Common site did ]”
2. The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Burnt Common strategic industrial employment site for light industry, storage and distribution activities. It is to be designated an Industrial Strategic Employment Site which means that it is a preferred site for industrial development including waste management facilities. The site is 9ha which it is stated allows for considerable future expansion. This will generate large amounts of traffic including heavy vehicles on the A247.

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing
pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline
developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been
consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and
Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land
for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment
floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for
an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of
4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space
than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to
develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately
half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial
space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced
by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the
poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot
apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2064</th>
<th>Respondent: 17296321 / Robyn Cormack</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Burnt Common strategic industrial employment site for light industry, storage and distribution activities. It is to be
designated an Industrial Strategic Employment Site which means that it is a preferred site for industrial development
including waste management facilities. The site is 9ha which it is stated allows for considerable future expansion. This
will generate large amounts of traffic including heavy vehicles on the A247.

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial
Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the
objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has
been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to
build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density
of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the development of Burnt Common. The potential huge strategic employment site at Burnt Common will inevitably cause significant increases in traffic in the area. This development combined with Garlick’s Housing site will result in the urbanisation of the village at its west boundary.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

New Policy A58 – Land around Burnt Common Warehouse, London Road Send P2 and A58.

This new policy A58 seeks to increase the area of land to be extracted from the Greenbelt for a minimum of 7,000 sq.m of employment floorspace. So I strongly object to this proposal on the grounds that there is no proven need to allocate any Green Belt land within the borough for industrial/warehouse development. This development will have a severe impact not only on the two villages but will create major traffic problems throughout the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Policy A58 - Burnt Common

My objections are that this was deleted from the 2014 Draft - why have you now resurrected it and added it to the revised proposal?

1. There has been a decline for the need of industrial land - many office buildings and industrial lands stand derelict why build more?

2. Slyfield and Guildford have empty sites and industrial units - USE THESE FIRST. There is no need to build an industrial or warehouse unit in the middle of the Green Belt.

3. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

4. The impact on narrow surrounding country lanes will create traffic gridlock

5. As stated before
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2266  Respondent: 17302497 / F Bennett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

• The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm,… (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]”
• The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2270  Respondent: 17302753 / Mark & Lucy Ingram  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

strongly object to the following proposals set out in the document:

Burnt Common strategic industrial development site

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2320  Respondent: 17303745 / Christine M Macnair  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch)
GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

1. *The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, … (site allocation A25) [than the Burnt Common site did]*”
2. *The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”*

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2323  **Respondent:** 17303745 / Christine M Macnair  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2412  **Respondent:** 17308417 / Shirley Bowerman  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to this proposal as it was deleted from the 2014 draft because of the number of objections previously lodged and nothing relevant his since happened.

I object because the word ‘maximum’ for industrial use (which was more than enough already) has unbelievably been altered to ‘minimum’ which means that there would be an obligatory 7000 square feet of building on the site and no top limit to the industrial buildings allowed in the new plan. This cannot be right when there has been a decline in the demand for industrial land.

I object because this site was deleted from the 2014 draft as a result of all the objections. It cannot now be right that it has now been reinstated greatly enlarged. Something very sinister must be going on for this to be done.

I object because there is absolutely no need to build industrial or warehouse buildings in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford have empty sites and industrial units. One wonders what is going on.
I object because the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole Borough, not a huge over-allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt. Again, it appears that a huge unnecessary project is being proposed to destroy this beautiful part of the Green Belt, to nobody’s benefit but those with an interest in development.

I object to this proposal because it will lead to gridlock both on small local roads and on the Guildford By-pass.

I object to this proposal because it will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2505  Respondent: 17316257 / Neeley Jackson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

This is of huge concern to me as a new local resident. Not only from a health perspective but yet again for the congestion this will add to the surrounding area

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3072  Respondent: 17321089 / David Banham  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:

It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously

The word "minimum" is a change from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land

There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units

The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt

The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock

It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
The attached letter has been prepared by WYG on behalf of the site owner of Burnt Common Nurseries - The Newship Group. It is submitted in support of the Proposed submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2017 (Regulation 19 submission) insofar as it proposes the allocation of Burnt Common Nurseries for commercial development. Further information is contained in the attached.

Kind regards

[text of attachment reproduced below]

Introduction and Summary case

We are writing on behalf of our clients, Burnt Common Nurseries Ltd, to support the allocation in the emerging Guildford Local Plan of the land known as Burnt Common Nurseries, London Road, Send, for a minimum of 7,000sqm of floorspace falling within Use Classes B1(c), B2 and B8.

Please find enclosed with this letter:
- A statement from Lambert Smith Hampton that examines the local industrial market, the projected need and comments on the appropriateness of the proposed allocation for employment use;
- A Technical Note from RGP on the impact of the proposed allocation on the local highway network; and
- Historical photographs showing the commercial nursery buildings on the site (now demolished).

The allocation is strongly supported to meet the required quantum of employment floorspace identified in the Council’s Employment Land Needs Assessment (AECOM, March 2017), for the Plan period (2015-34) and provide flexibility to help meet future needs/ additional capacity within the Plan period, should this be required.

The Burnt Common Nurseries site (BCN) can accommodate the required minimum quantum of development – a minimum of 7,000 square metres of employment floorspace – at a very early stage in the Plan period and with no significant adverse impact on the highway network, the environment, the character of the surrounding area or residential amenity.

The site is very well screened, particularly from the A3 and nearby limited residential development. As a result, with the exception of the access points from the B2215, development of the site would not be materially visible from the surrounding public realm.

There are very strong reasons for developing the BCN site for new floorspace within Use Classes B1(c), B2 and B8, which are discussed below.

Taking into account all planning considerations, the site is one of the most sustainable and deliverable locations in the Borough for new employment development over the Plan period. It is also able to be brought forward at a very early stage in the Plan period, further contributing to sustainability objectives. Accordingly, the site has been allocated in the emerging Guildford Local Plan for a minimum of 7,000sqm of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8) with a potential for further industrial floorspace to meet future borough needs.

The wording of the Policy is strongly supported as it aims to facilitate development in the short term to meet immediate identified need, whilst providing flexibility for the future.
Landowners credentials
The Newship Group is a family owned business with mainly manufacturing and distribution companies across the UK and Europe. The Group was founded 40 years ago and during this time it has built a number of industrial estates, some of which remain within the Group. Today the Group manages over 1,000,000sqft of industrial buildings.

Over the last four years, the Newship Group has worked closely and positively with the Council to bring forward the undeveloped part of the site for business use.

Site ownership
The proposed allocation and the existing employment land it surrounds are in one ownership - Burnt Common Nurseries Ltd. which is part of Newship Group. The site comprises of three warehouses totalling approx. 5,110sqm (55,000sqft).

Site description
The site lies between Guildford to the south-west and Woking to the north. The site has good access to the highway network with the B2215 leading directly onto the A3 at Ripley and just one junction up the A3 is junction 10 of the M25.

The site is currently an undeveloped greenfield site comprising approximately 10.6 ha. in size. It lies within the Green Belt, but adjacent to the existing settlement of Burnt Common and Send Marsh.

It comprises land that was previously occupied by vast commercial greenhouses on gently undulating ground (see enclosed photographs). It is enclosed by tree belts to the north and east, tree cover to the south and hedgerows to the east. Urban influences are provided by the residential properties to the east on the Clandon Road behind a row of mature trees, and the adjacent commercial uses to the west (see enclosed photographs).

The overall land holding is not subject to any statutory or non-statutory landscape designations, or cultural or heritage designations. A disused public footpath lies to the east. This previously extended southwards, however the construction of the A3 severed this route and it has been formally extinguished.

The subject site is situated to the south of London Road (B2215), which was formally part of the A3. It is bordered to the south by the current A3, with an area of ancient woodland adjacent and separating the site from the A3.

The site is located directly off the little used but very safe south-west bound carriageway of the B2215. The south-west bound carriageway of the road is wide enough to accommodate two lanes of traffic and the southern side of the road is currently hatched and could be easily modified to safely accommodate the new access. A safe highway access from the site onto this road already exists. In 2016, the landowners transport consultants, RGP, assessed the transport impacts of the proposed development. This has been updated in light of the allocation. RGP conclude that:
- Suitable vehicular access can be provided;
- The development of a minimum of 7,000sqm of employment floorspace would have a negligible impact in terms of the operational capacity of existing local road junctions; and
- The development can be delivered without the need for any additional slip roads to/from the A3 at Burnt Common.

RGP have found that the proposed development would have a negligible impact on the local highway network and development of the site could even deliver highway improvements that would benefit the operation of the Burnt Common roundabout. A copy of their assessment is attached to this letter.

The character of the area surrounding the site is a mix of residential and commercial. Within the site are three existing commercial units, which provide 5,110sqm of floorspace in Use Classes B1/ B2 and B8. Directly adjoining the site to the east are residential dwellings, which form part of the area known as Burnt Common/ Send Marsh and this character extends north and eastwards.

Relevant background, history and assessment
The land at Burnt Common Nurseries is a previously developed site located within the Green Belt. The site was originally a commercial nursery, which opened in 1970 and employed 100 people, with seasonal workers increasing this figure to over 200 before Mother's Day and Christmas. The business consisted of three acres of commercial greenhouses to the east of the existing warehouse. In 1993 the Company was forced to close due to fluctuating exchange rates and overseas
competition. The following year Consent was given for the demolition of the greenhouses and the change of use of the 40,000sqft warehouse to unrestricted B8 use. In 1998 permission was granted for a further 11,000sqft industrial building.

Following review of the Green Belt and Countryside Study (GBCS, 2013/’14), it was identified as a Potential Development Area (PDA) due to its sustainability credentials, accessibility and defensible boundaries.

The site was also identified in the Council’s Strategy and Sites Issues and Options Paper as having good potential for industrial (Use Class B2) and/or warehouse (Use Class B8) uses (see Information Sheet 59 in Appendix D of the Issues and Options Paper 2013).

The site was subsequently allocated in the Draft Local Plan (2014), for at least 7,000sqm of light industrial (Use Class B1c), general industrial (Use Class B2) and/or storage and distribution (Use Class B8) employment buildings and approximately 100 homes (Use Class C3). Land to the east of the existing warehouses was considered appropriate for new homes. Land to the rear and the west of the existing employment buildings was considered appropriate for employment expansion. This allocation was supported by local people and businesses.

The site was removed from the emerging Plan in 2015 in favour of land at Garlick’s Arch, to the north-east of Clandon Road. The Garlick’s Arch site was allocated for employment land and up to 400 homes. Allocation of the Garlick’s Arch site for future development included, in a separate allocation, the provision of a north-bound on-slip onto the A3 and the potential for a southbound off-slip, creating a full four-way interchange between the A3 and Clandon Road (A247) in this location.

At their meeting on Tuesday 24th May 2016, Full Council agreed the Draft Plan for consultation, including the land at Garlick’s Arch and excluding BCN. There was considerable support from the public at the meeting for the Burnt Common Nurseries site.

Objections were voiced to the proposed allocation of land at Garlick’s Arch due to its size and the scale of development (not being commensurate with the scale and nature of the local area), openness in the landscape, poor sustainability credentials (in comparison to the Burnt Common Nurseries site), an inappropriate location for industrial and commercial development, because of the need to drive through a large part of the village to access the site, the risk of flooding, the potential for development to adversely affect three areas of ancient woodland and infrastructure constraints/impact on local services and facilities.

In addition, a very large number of local people and businesses made over 1,600 separate representations on the 2016 public consultation version of the then Proposed Submission Local Plan, specifically on the proposed allocations at Garlick’s Arch and Burnt Common Nurseries. The overwhelming majority of representations objected to the proposed development of Garlick’s Arch, requesting that the land at Burnt Common Nurseries be re-allocated instead. The reasons for this included the fact that the site is previously developed as an established employment site.

As a result, the land at Burnt Common Nurseries was re-allocated for a minimum of 7,000sqm industrial and warehouse development in the Proposed Submission Local Plan (2017). The Council is currently inviting comments on changes to the Proposed Submission Plan (a targeted consultation) prior to submitting the Plan for independent examination. One of the changes is that the amount of employment floorspace to be provided during the Plan period is amended in light of the ELNA. The changes to Policy E1 (in light of the ELNA) and the allocation of BCN as an industrial employment site are supported.

In allocating the site, the Council found that:

1. Land to the west of the existing warehouses is suitable for new employment uses (Use Classes B1c, B2 and B8); and
2. That if new homes are not provided (as shown in the previous 2014 Draft Local Plan), the whole of the site is suitable for new employment uses.

Thus, the entire site has been fully assessed and is considered suitable for employment development.

A credible location for employment development

The Newship Group is primarily interested in delivering employment floorspace and has been working towards achieving this objective in collaboration with the Council for a number of years. There are four main reasons why the Burnt Common Nurseries site is considered a credible location to deliver the employment space needed.
Firstly, it is an existing employment site with three industrial/warehouse buildings totalling 5,110sqm. It makes sense to consolidate employment at Burnt Common in association with existing buildings. It is also a more efficient use of land and would result in an external economy of scale, due to its location adjacent to similar enterprises.

Secondly, it offers the opportunity to deliver early expansion of employment floorspace, which is a key factor in achieving wider sustainability objectives. Widening the choice and availability of employment floorspace within the Borough supports the local economy by providing high quality accommodation in a convenient location, including incubator units for existing local businesses to move into, freeing up space for start-ups and smaller companies.

The site is not dependent on new access roads and there are no other site constraints. It is not in a restrictive flood zone. Given the lack of such constraints the Newship Group and Burnt Common Nurseries Ltd are in the position to submit a planning application and begin on-site straight away. That is important, because deliverability is a key issue when assessing the soundness of the emerging Plan at the Local Plan examination.

Thirdly, the BCN site is an acceptable site that does not compromise the purposes of the Green Belt. The site has a significant proportion of previously-developed land. The site is 10.7 hectares (26.44 acres), so a minimum of an additional 7,000sqm of employment space could easily be absorbed without having an adverse impact on openness or the five purposes of the Green Belt.

Fourthly, the site is sustainable, with good vehicular access that minimises the impact on the local highway network and local residents. The site is close enough to Send Marsh to provide shorter and more convenient journeys to work and promote rural sustainability, but is also sufficiently removed from the main residential areas and sufficiently screened by mature trees to minimise impact on residential amenity. The existing highway network facilitates convenient access to and from the A3 without needing to travel through the existing village.

The proposed development of the site was supported by local people and businesses through the public consultation on earlier versions of the emerging Local Plan. This is discussed in more detail below.

In summary, the site is a logical, reliable and credible allocation for employment space, with no material constraints. The Newship Group is committed to providing this, and its track-record offers peace of mind that it would be delivered early and to a high standard.

In overall terms the proposal to locate further employment space alongside an existing commercial employment estate (and a former commercial nursery) is the most logical and appropriate solution for the Burntcommon and Sendmarsh area. The Newship Group, operators of BCN Ltd, have significant experience of developing such employment sites. The lack of constraints and single ownership ensure that early delivery is achievable.

Site sustainability
A key consideration in assessing the suitability of the site for the size and type of development proposed is the need to ensure that the site is in a location that is sufficiently sustainable for the level of development envisaged.

The site is in a sustainable location given its size, character and function. As explained in more detail below, the size of the site is appropriate to the existing scale of the village and its character. A significant part of the site is also already in use for employment purposes and the proposed allocation is for additional Use Class B1(c), B2 and B8 commercial units. Given the allocation does not include any element of housing development, all of the site is suitable for industrial and warehouse units.

The site is accessible by public transport, walking and cycling and benefits from pedestrian and cycle access to a range of local services and facilities. The centre of Send Village, which has numerous shops and local facilities/amenities, is within 2km from the site, with Send/Ripley health centre and pharmacy only 500m from the site, and this is acknowledged by national policy as being an acceptable walking distance.

There are a number of bus stops within 400-500m of the site. Bus services 462 and 463 together provide an hourly service Monday to Friday between Woking and Guildford and also serve the residential areas of West Clandon, Send Marsh and Old Woking. Bus service 515/515A also provides an hourly service between Guildford and Kingston-upon-Thames Monday to Sunday.
In terms of a railway station, the main line station at West Clandon is approximately 2.5km to the south of the site and linked with the site by bus service 463. This station benefits from regular services between Guildford and London Waterloo. Guildford and Woking railway stations, which are accessible by bus services 462 and 463 are on the fast line to London Waterloo, Basingstoke, Portsmouth and Alton. Existing rail facilities provide the opportunity to travel to the site by train as part of a linked bus or cycle journey.

There is an existing footpath on the northern side of the B2215, which provides connections to nearby bus stops and continues to other local facilities available in the vicinity of the site. There is also an existing on-road cycleway on both sides of London Road, which continues along the B2215 Portsmouth Road and provides a local connection to the centre of Ripley. A dedicated cycle route also runs alongside the A3 leading south-west towards Burpham (approximately 3.5km away), where it links to the wider cycle network around Guildford. There is a further shared pedestrian/ cycle link along the A247 between Burnt Common roundabout and local amenities in Send. To the south-east a further cycle link runs east along Tithebarns Lane connecting to a wider cycle network towards West Horsley. The site therefore benefits from good pedestrian and cycle connections.

The following local amenities are located in close proximity to the site – a petrol station with a Little Waitrose convenience store approximately 100m from the site, a doctor’s surgery and pharmacy 500m away. Further convenience stores, newsagents, takeaway restaurants, a café and a post office are located in Send village (via Send Barns Lane), approximately 2km away. Further amenities are available at Ripley High Street which is 3km away.

In addition to this the site is within easy access of both the A3 and M25, with the B2215 providing direct access to both.

The sustainability credentials of the site and its proximity to the facilities of Send have undoubtedly contributed to Burnt Common/ Send Marsh being classified as a village. With all of this in mind it is considered that the site is sustainably located and therefore accords with the principle of sustainable development in this regard.

Indeed, the ‘Send Marsh and Burntcommon – Major Village Expansion’ review carried out as part of the Green Belt and Countryside Study (2014), considered the sustainability credentials of the site as existing (as well as two other local sites). Significantly, it ranked the Burnt Common Nurseries site in first place out of all the sites.

As such, the Burnt Common Nurseries site has strong sustainability credentials.

Need for commercial development

In March 2017 AECOM prepared an Employment Land Needs Assessment for Guildford Borough. Whilst the assessment does not compare the existing supply and its capacity to accommodate the future demand for employment land or the suitability of sites to cater for future demand, it does state that ‘Businesses in Guildford are to be seen to be broadly satisfied with current premises, although a significant number of them see potential for growth in the future and are said to need space for expansion.’

The ELNA also finds that there is evidence of a lack of affordable start up and incubator units in the Borough.

Paragraph 3.3.1 states that the demand for employment space will be driven in part by population change. With a forecast growth in population of just over 15% over the Plan period (and a percentage of residents of working age that is comparable with both the South East and England as a whole), the demand for employment space is highly likely to increase.

The ability of the site to provide industrial and commercial units (including small and medium sized units) early in the Plan period will support the local economy by facilitating growth in at least the following ways:
- Increasing the overall supply (to assist in maintaining a sustainable form of development Borough wide);
- The provision of incubator units on the site; and
- Providing choice and flexibility for start-up businesses. This is particularly the case where existing occupiers are looking to expand (paragraphs 5.5.4 and 5.5.5 of the ELNA).

AECOM undertook consultation with property market experts to inform the ELNA. The feedback received is that the current supply of industrial and storage premises is not meeting existing demand. This is exactly the finding of Lambert Smith Hampton (LSH) in their report dated August 2016, which was submitted in support of the request to re-allocate the
Burnt Common Nurseries site. The lack of available sites (and those sites that are available tend not deliver the quality and space needed), act as a constraint on demand (see paragraph 5.6.3). Thus, economic growth would be supported through the provision of high quality stock that benefits from excellent road access, such as the Burnt Common Nurseries site.

Lambert Smith Hampton statement
The statement by Lambert Smith Hampton (LSH) on the need for small industrial and commercial units within the Borough has been updated. This updated statement (dated June 2017) is attached to this representation for consideration. LSH continue to find that the existing stock of buildings is very low and insufficient to meet future needs. In addition, the quality of the available stock is poor, which itself acts as a deterrent to potential occupiers (see LSH statement paragraph 4.26).

Thus, LSH conclude that there has been and remains insufficient employment land supply to meet future growth needs and so new employment sites are required and particularly to come forward at an early stage in the Plan period.

The LSH statement confirms that the Burnt Common Nurseries site is a suitable location for commercial units due to its proximity and accessibility to the principal road network and is able to be developed quickly.

The LSH statement explains that the emerging Plan does not appear to specifically account for the loss of employment land (i.e. allocations of land currently in an employment use, proposed to be developed for a non-employment use). There are examples of this in the emerging Plan i.e. Kernal Court and Wey Corner, both on Walnut Tree Close, Guildford, for residential accommodation etc. As a result, this loss should be re-provided elsewhere in the Borough to avoid a reduction in employment floorspace, particularly at an early stage in the Plan period.

The need for flexibility
The Proposed Submission Local Plan (2017) makes provision for between 3.7 to 4.1ha. of additional industrial land to help support the economy. The Plan explains that this is a higher level of development than experienced in Guildford during the previous Plan period and represents an increase in employment floorspace.

The Council has resolved to plan for a central case of between 3.9ha. and 4.1ha. of additional industrial employment land during the Plan period (2015-2034). The majority of the proposed new employment floorspace is allocated in urban extensions to Guildford; as part of the Slyfield Area Regeneration Project (SARP), Blackwell Farm, Gosden Hill Farm and at the former Wisley airfield. These are strategic locations that will take many years to come forward.

The Employment Land Topic Paper finds that a ‘large proportion of the net additional land requirement for industrial/ storage may be met through the permissions which have been consented but which have yet to be implemented. This includes up to 7,000sqm (on 1.4ha.) at Henley Business Park and 1,800sqm at Woodbridge Meadows. There is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or as many of the permissions are flexible (B1c/ B2/ B8), there is uncertainty into exactly which Use Class may be built out. The two main locations for industrial and storage development are on Burnt Common (7,000sqm) and as part of the Slyfield Area Regeneration Project (6,500sqm additional).’ Paragraph 7.7 of the LSH statement quotes paragraph 4.50 of Guildford Borough Council’s Employment Topic Paper (June 2017), which states that ‘The delivery of [SARP]… is not expected until the latter part of the plan period.’

There is clearly a need for flexibility in the provision of employment land, particularly industrial land, to accommodate needs as they arise and enable the Plan to respond to changes in the wider economy. The Burnt Common Nurseries site achieves both objectives, by delivering new employment floorspace very early in the Plan period and offers the flexibility required to respond to changing economic circumstances. The deliverability and flexibility of the site to support wider sustainability objectives is a key strength and it is therefore important that the flexibility as currently expressed in the proposed allocation is retained.

The allocation of land at Burnt Common Nurseries facilitates the early delivery of employment floorspace that has been demonstrated to be urgently needed. Provision of a range of commercial units (including small and medium sized), would contribute to the objectives of sustainable development by helping to meet the existing need for high quality and conveniently located industrial and warehouse floorspace and facilitate job creation opportunities at an early stage in the Plan period.
The proposal can be delivered very quickly due to the lack of site constraints, the fact the site is all in one ownership, there is an existing access onto the road network (B2215), development of the site would have a very limited impact on the local landscape and Green Belt (due to its heavily enclosed nature) and would enable the openness of the Green Belt and its open character to remain and continue throughout the Plan period.

Also, in accordance with sustainable development objectives, the emerging Local Plan seeks to support the future economic, environmental and social sustainability of rural settlements, commensurate to their size, character and function.

The scale of the proposed development is commensurate with the size, character and function of Burnt Common/ Send Marsh. The settlement is a village and increasing its size by 7,000sqm + of industrial/ warehouse floorspace would not harm the size, character or function of the location. The allocation supports the growth of this part of the Borough, which is planned for significant housing development in the Plan period. The provision of employment land (delivered early in the Plan period) in the vicinity of new housing development contributes to sustainable development as envisaged in the NPPF (paragraphs 7 – 10). This is recognised in the emerging Local Plan.

There are also local services and facilities within close proximity to the site, which offer an existing facility for employees. Provision of facilities for employees will also be made on the site however, with space for a food kiosk, a sitting out area and landscaped open space.

The above evidence supports the allocation of the Burnt Common Nurseries site for development in the emerging Local Plan.

Unique location
As described above, the site is wedged between existing roads, comprising the A3 and the old A3 (now B2215) and existing development fronting Clandon Road (A247).

From a review of the GBCS the site falls within a parcel of land (B13-D), which as previously stated, has been identified as a PDA. Paragraph 1.37 of Volume I of the GBCS states that the land parcel in which the site falls within has the potential to accommodate appropriate development without compromising the purposes of the Green Belt in which it is located. It is noted to be an area that is surrounded by defensible boundaries and these include built physical features (roads) and significant tree screening.

The site, and indeed wider land parcel in which it is located is isolated from the wider green belt by the A3, the London Road and the Clandon Road which surround the site, making it an enclosed triangular parcel of land that is very much separated from the wider Green Belt. This helps to further ensure that development of the site (and wider land parcel) would not harm the character or appearance of the Green Belt in which it is located and would not set a precedent.

This scenario is very similar to, and is supported by, the Burpham Court Farm development known as Weybrook (now a housing development with a large Sainsbury’s supermarket), which is also between the A3 and an A3 slip road. If new slip roads were provided at Burnt Common/ Send Marsh, this would improve its attractiveness to businesses from further afield.

The Council accepted the above and has allocated the site in the Draft Local Plan for commercial development.

Emerging Planning Policy
Policy D4 of the Submission Local Plan (2016) explains that development must contribute towards achieving high quality and attractive places. The proposed allocation of the Burnt Common Nurseries site would be of high quality and use land in an efficient manner, whilst retaining and enhancing a significant landscaped buffer around the perimeter of the site, which would improve its attractiveness. No important public views would be affected. As explained further below, the site is accessible and the proposal would create safe access to the site by a variety of modes. Crime and disorder would be discouraged through designing the layout of the commercial units to overlook each other and the parking and turning areas.

The design and orientation of the proposed units would make sure that there would be no unacceptable impact on amenities in terms of privacy, noise, vibration, pollution, dust, smell and access to sunlight and daylight.
Proposed Policy A58

Policy A58 (of the Proposed Submission Local Plan) allocates the site for a minimum of 7,000sqm of either or a mix of B1, B2 or B8 floorspace, with the potential for further industrial floorspace to meet future Borough needs. The allocation is supported as currently proposed as it provides an appropriate Green Belt buffer between the proposed north-eastwards expansion of Guildford (Gosden Hill Farm allocation) and the existing built up area of Send Marsh/ Burnt Common.

In addition, the flexibility of the Policy is supported. The Council has allocated various sites for employment development in the Plan period; however should these sites not come forward as anticipated it could have an impact on the overall supply of employment land in the Borough. Furthermore, other existing sites could potentially be lost to non-employment uses. As a result, the potential to release additional land for employment floorspace during the Plan period, to help meet need, is a prudent approach and supported.

The description of the site in Policy A58 refers to the existing use as pastoral farmland. This description of the site is inaccurate; it would be more appropriate to describe the site as former commercial nursery.

Public consultation

The Local Planning Authority has undertaken a series of comprehensive public consultation exercises on the emerging Local Plan, gaining local opinion on key issues affecting the Borough and informing the Authority of the view of local people in deciding how best to accommodate future development. A clear message made by local residents throughout the Borough is the need for the timely provision of infrastructure to support planned new development.

In relation to future development at Send Marsh/ Burnt Common, the overwhelming perspective of local residents is that the BCN site is a sustainable and appropriate site for development that would not have an adverse effect on existing infrastructure, or the five purposes of the Green Belt. BCN is recognised as a previously developed site, which should be used to best effect, in advance of Greenfield land. It is noteworthy that the Parish Councils in the area have not objected to the allocation of land at BCN; on the contrary they have supported the allocation of BCN and questioned the logic of de-allocating it in favour of a larger Greenfield site, the development of which would not be commensurate with the scale and nature of the existing area. Indeed, Send Parish Council advised in their response to the 2016 consultation that they consider BCN to be an appropriate allocation and requested it be reinstated in the Proposed Submission Plan.

Deliverability

In terms of deliverability the site is available and deliverable with 1-5 years (subject to securing planning permission). The owners are committed to developing the site for employment use and are undertaking the necessary assessments to support an application.

The proposed development of the Burnt Common Nurseries site includes space around the buildings, some of which will include sitting out areas. The environment will be enhanced through the provision of soft landscaping to strengthen wildlife links to and from the adjacent ancient woodland and noise generating sources would not be located unacceptably close to existing residential development.

Finally, the provision of a range of commercial unit sizes, commensurate with the size, character and function of Burnt Common/ Send Marsh, benefits the local area without having a serious adverse impact on local services and facilities. It is clear therefore that a development of this type contributes to the three main aims of sustainable development – social, economic and environmental.

Conclusion

It is considered that given the subject sites’ location, its sustainability credentials and the Council’s economic assessment and GBCS it represents a prime opportunity for commercial development that it has been demonstrated is commensurate with the size, character and function of the existing settlement.

It is considered that a minimum of 7,000sqm floorspace can be achieved on the site, which would represent a suitably low density of development. This in turn enables the site to retain an open and spacious character, and retention and sympathetic enhancement to the existing ancient woodland through strengthening the tree belts around the site to provide wildlife corridors to adjacent areas.

The allocation of the BCN site in the emerging Local Plan is supported for the following reasons:
- The site is in a sustainable location, with very good transport accessibility.
- Development for a minimum of 7,000sqm employment floorspace would have a negligible impact on the operation of the existing highway network (see RGP’s Transport Impact Assessment).
- The site is part previously developed.
- The Council identified and allocated the site for future development in the emerging Plan.
- The site has defensible boundaries which will ensure that its development will not harm the purpose or openness of the wider Green Belt.
- The site is isolated from the wider Green Belt.
- The site is not constrained by any other sensitive planning designations.
- The site is deliverable within 1 – 5 years.
- The site provides the opportunity for expansion subject to future need.
- The site offers flexibility to also make for the loss of supply of existing sites (see conclusion of LSH statement).
- The site is similar to the previously developed site Weybrook in Burpham (now a housing development with a Sainsbury’s supermarket) which also lies between the A3 and a slip road.
- The site would not impact materially on any existing residential properties.
- The site is well screened already by mature tree planting, which can be further enhanced.

With all of the above in mind we assert that the subject site is suitable, developable and deliverable for commercial development. We support the allocation of the site for at least 7,000sqm employment floorspace in the Council’s emerging Local Plan and exclusion from the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2596</th>
<th>Respondent: 17325665 / Claire Nix</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2636</th>
<th>Respondent: 17328801 / Adriana Barnes</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy A58 land at Burnt Common, London Rd

I object to a new allocation of 7,000 sq m of industrial or warehousing which was deleted from the 2015 draft. I also object to the wording of the allocation: the 2016 "maximum" allocation of 7,000 sq m has now been changed to "minimum". There is a surplus of industrial premises in the borough and the requirement for further industrial/warehousing has not been proven. The road infrastructure is inadequate and there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant development on the green belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2638</th>
<th>Respondent: 17329025 / Andrew Hollis</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to Policy A58 Land at Burnt Common Send because:

1. a) It had been deleted from the 2014 draft There Local Plan because of all the objections previously made.

1. b) There are empty sites and industrial units at Slyfield and Guildford therefore there is no need to build warehouse or industrial development in the middle of the green belt.

1. c) The impact on the small surrounding roads will be intolerable and create traffic gridlock. It is like this most of the time anyway especially if there are problems on the A3 or M25.

1. d) The employment land Need Assessment (2017) shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares in Send on the Green Belt.
1. e) The word "minimum" is a change from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan and since then there has been a decline in demand for industrial land.

1. f) This over development will join up existing villages and defeat the object of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2640  Respondent: 17329217 / Karis Barnes  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a new allocation of 7,000 sq m of industrial or warehousing which was deleted from the 2015 draft. I also object to the wording of the allocation: the 2016 "maximum" allocation of 7,000 sq m has now been changed to "minimum". There is a surplus of industrial premises in the borough and the requirement for further industrial/warehousing has not been proven. The road infrastructure is inadequate and there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant development on the green belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2646  Respondent: 17329537 / D S White  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A58 at Burnt Common
Guildford Council have seen fit to increase industrial development on this land by increasing the MAXIMUM developable area referred to in the 2016 Plan to a MINIMUM area of 7000sq. m. in this Plan. The Employment Land Need identifies a REDUCTION of need to 3.9 hectares across the whole Borough so how can the increase of at least 7 hectares, at one location, be justified?
Why not develop existing industrial land much of which is in Council ownership.
No reference has been made in the Plan to the increase of atmospheric pollution from diesel engined Heavy Goods Vehicles.
The Burnt Common roundabout is already congested by vehicles of all types. "leapfrogging" the congestion on the A3.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2943  Respondent: 17344801 / Graham Rendell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because of many of the previous points above but also because it was already dropped from the 2014 draft and nothing as far as I can see has changed. There still seem to be empty units in Guildford such as the Slyfield estate.

More importantly it seems the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough. So why should this plan suggest an INCREASE of 10 hectares in the Green belt in Send?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2715  Respondent: 17344865 / Freya Risdon  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I also object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:
• It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously.
• The word 'minimum' is a change from the previous 'maximum' in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land.
• There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty site and industrial units.
• The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 ha. for industrial land for the whole borough, not a huge over-allocation of 10 ha. at Send in the Green Belt.
• The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
• It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2775  Respondent: 17357249 / E Turner  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2827</th>
<th>Respondent: 17366145 / Tara Cooling</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object strongly. This clearly ignores the separation issue sited in previous plan between Gosden hill development and Send Marsh/Burnt Common. The area cannot take the extra traffic flow that will happen on already over congested roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object strongly to proposal for Waste Management facilities in Green belt A58 Burnt Common. This [illegible word] not allowed for full and proper consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I therefore strongly object to all proposed development A34, A43, A58, A42 on the grounds that the area will be grossly overcrowded causing urban sprawl. The roads are already at maximum capacity. One small breakdown occurrence in area causes vast traffic jams. I also object to the fact that the Guildford Borough Council ignored the thousands of objections from the Send/Ripley area and instead increased the allocation of housing etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2832</th>
<th>Respondent: 17366465 / J F Harris</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to POLICY A581 the land at London Road, Burntcommon, where it is now proposed to use the whole triangle of Green Belt land between the A3, Clandon Road, A247, and the old dead leg of the former dual carriageway that used to be the A3 before the Ripley By-Pass was opened 41 years ago. This new proposal will now take up 10 hectares, rather than the relatively small area previously allocated, and will vastly increase traffic flows and problems in the Burntcommon area, which are already very bad, especially at peak hours. The additional industrial traffic generated by these proposals will make the problems even worse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2836</th>
<th>Respondent: 17366881 / Amanda Stevens</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common. It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously but yet it seems to have been reinstated. I cannot believe that there is a need to build an industrial or warehouse development in the middle of greenbelt when Slyfield and Guildford have empty sites and industrial units. Again, the repercussions of all that extra traffic will cause complete gridlock in the mornings. These roads are usually heavily congested as it is, apart from a couple of months in the summer.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2902  Respondent: 17370209 / T Hodkinson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We object to policy A58 - on the grounds that it is Green-belt land so development is not permitted. There is vacant industrial property in the region, so there is no need for further industrial space now or in the foreseeable future. We object to the change of wording to 'minimum to replace maximum' of 7000 sq m, as this is a deliberate act to open up our area to unlimited development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2935  Respondent: 17373505 / Paul Beach  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Burnt Common Policy A58
I OBJECT to the new allocation of a minimum of 7000 sq in of Industrial or warehousing space on this site. (I note the change from the previous 'maximum' to 'minimum')

This is a massive over allocation of land in the Green Belt for B1c, B2 and B8 usage.

There are vacant sites and warehousing on existing industrial parks in Slyfield and Guildford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the Policy A58, land at Burnt Common, London Road for the following reasons:

1. This was deleted from the 2014 draft plan because of all the objections previously made – therefore why has it been included again?
2. There has been a decline in demand for industrial land since the previous draft plant but the 2016 version uses the word ‘maximum’ a change from ‘minimum’ within it – this does not make sense.
3. There are already empty sites and units at Slyfield and Guildford and therefore no need to build new industrial and warehouse developments in our area. I can only envisage these will end up being empty too.
4. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand for industrial land for the whole borough to 3.9 hectares. This policy is a huge allocation of 10 hectares for Send alone. Totally unacceptable.
5. The small roads around this area are already often at gridlock. This can only make the problem worse.
6. The merging of existing villages (which will occur) defeats the purpose of the Green Belt.

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58) The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned in policy 4.423a and does not allow for full and proper consultation. This is unacceptable

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
decline in demand for industrial land
There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt

The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock

It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3041  Respondent: 17381601 / Madeleine Stevens  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common. I do not see why an industrial development is required when there are empty sites and industrial units at Slyfield and in Guildford?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3089  Respondent: 17383969 / Maureen Mitchell  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlicks Arch to be included.

I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58):

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3178  Respondent: 17399681 / Anthony Smith  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
The inclusion of Policy A58 (Burnt Common) is wholly inappropriate. The site provides an essential green buffer between Send and the A3, and the provision of so much industrial space there will result in an unacceptable strain on local infrastructure, particularly local roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Policy A58: Land at Burntcommon, London Road

I object to this Policy. Where does it make business sense to build industrial space on Green Belt Land when there are empty sites and industrial units in Slyfield Trading Estate in Guildford?

As detailed above local roads cannot support the increase in traffic and certainly cannot support heavy transport lorries. The local first school is in Send Barnes Lane and building on this land will be a safety risk to the pupils there. The Council does not have the right to ignore current residents and railroad decisions without understanding the local needs and limitations of infrastructure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Policy A58 Land at Burnt Common, London Road. I object because: it has not taken into account previous objections; the word "maximum" in 2016 plan has been changed to "minimum", during this time the demand for industrial land and units has declined supported in 2017 Employment Land Needs assessment of 3.9 hectares not the huge allocation of 10 hectares in send; the related traffic will place a huge burden on local roads surface quality and significantly higher traffic volumes with larger queues and poor air quality; joins up existing villages quashing the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
As a resident of Clandon Road, Burnt Common I find it incredible that GBC have failed to listen to the residents of Send and Burnt Common who previously in force have objected to the proposed Local Plan. Instead you seem to have made further changes that result in more development rather than less, failing in the duty of GBC to listen to residents.

It seems that you are simply ‘testing’ the patience of residents by repeatedly making further changes without realising that your proposals are completely unacceptable. It is unjust that you are focussing a disproportionate level of development in and around the Burnt Common and Send compared with our areas of the Borough.

I object to changes relating to Policy A58 Burnt Common because

- This Policy was deleted from the 2014 Plan following previous objections.

- Additionally I see the Plan now references ‘Minimum’ rather than the original ‘Maximum’ referring to the 7,000 sq feet of industrial or warehousing. If the original proposal was deleted again I see no reason why the changed plan actually increases the proposed level of development.

- The impact on the Clandon Road and adjoining roads will create huge traffic issues, and noise and light pollution issues.

- There is no need to develop on this section of Green Belt land when other local sites including Slyfield and Guildford have empty existing sites and ‘brown field’ sites amiable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3244  Respondent: 17402529 / Emma Buswell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common, London Road - which was deleted from the 2014 draft plan because of objections made previously. It is totally unnecessary and inappropriate to build industrial units on Green Belt land in a village of this size. There are already suitable and available sites within Slyfield and Guildford. Again any increased movements of industrial vehicles on the surrounding roads will lead to total gridlock.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3338  Respondent: 17407745 / Lilijana Howells  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to this site being included as well as Garlicks Arch.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp172/3360  Respondent: 17408065 / Daphne Hollett  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to this being brought back, bigger and more than even before, despite the huge volume of objections which led it to be removed previously. Its been brought back as a minimum of 7000 sq m of warehousing and appears to show utter disregard for the unnecessary damage to the green belt (which I believed was protected but which the GBC seem to feel is just protected in the past now and future generations will simply be deprived of if GBC don't step up and take better protection for it. Why is this even on here? I presume as a concession, of the line of "Lets add something back in which we had a load of objections to before and removed. When these people complain again we will concede and let this unnecessary one go, and they will take the other ridiculous plans getting rubber-stamped better". GBC need to remove this plan once and for all. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows less of this type of property is needed and Slyfield has land and vacant buildings to accommodate such a need, if one even appears! Stop causing upset and concern for Send and surrounding villages and accept this is not needed, impacts the locals and the environment/green belt and is not even needed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3368  Respondent: 17408225 / Jill and Arthur Thomas  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58, Burnt Common, London Road because I don't believe there is a need for more industrial development here.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3382  Respondent: 17408321 / Graham Legge  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A58

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
- The word ‘minimum’ is a change from the previous ‘maximum’ in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in the demand for industrial land
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse developments in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
- It will join up the existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/3385</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>17408385 / Jon Cooling</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common. Notably it was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously. There is no need to build an industrial/warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when other places such as Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt. It is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation. Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openness of the Green Belt and is inappropriate.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/3420</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>17412193 / Beryl Evans</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The inclusion of site A58 Burnt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlicks Arch</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GBC’s own reasons for including Garlicks Arch A43 in the 2016 version were:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <em>The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, ...(site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did]</em>”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <em>The site [A43] provides the employment floor space needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlicks Arch to be included.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously.
- The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land.
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
- It will join up existing villages and defeat the key purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously.
- The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land.
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
- It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3526</th>
<th>Respondent: 17415873 / David Elvey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A58 – Land at Burnt Common because:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The 2017 Employment Need Assessment for the whole borough shows a demand reduction to 3.9 hectares, and such a demand for industrial or warehousing development can be met elsewhere in the borough without needing building in the middle of the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. As with the proposed development at Garlick’s Arch this will lead to excessive extra traffic which will cause overloading and gridlock of local and main roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3543</th>
<th>Respondent: 17416193 / Karen Howieson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to this policy because it was deleted from the 2014 draft because of previous objections. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units and the impact on small surrounding roads will create even greater traffic gridlock than exists presently. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3549</th>
<th>Respondent: 17416641 / Naomi Lord</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Burnt Common, London Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Now a new allocation for a MINIMUM of 7,000 sq m of industrial or warehousing</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the word “minimum” now being shown which changed from “maximum” in the 2016 Plan as since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We will become a suburb joining into Ripley which works against the the creation of the Green Belt which is to protect natural or semi natural environments, protect unique character of rural communities that might be absorbed by expanding suburbs. I object to the traffic congestion this will have on the A247 and smaller roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document page number</th>
<th>Section page number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1393</td>
<td>359 of 405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the need to build warehouse/industrial development in the middle of the Green Belt because Slyfield/Guildford have empty sites and industrial units.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3554  Respondent: 17416801 / Angharad Good  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Now a new allocation for a minimum of 7,000 sq m of industrial or warehousing
I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:

• It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
• The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land.
• There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
• The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt
• The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
• It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3563  Respondent: 17416929 / Ian Waring  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As above, existing brownfield sites could be utilised to accommodate the required development. There are unused sites and existing capacity for expansion in areas such as Slyfield. Traffic would increase through Send to unacceptable levels.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3577  Respondent: 17417217 / Paul Good  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Now a new allocation for a minimum of 7,000 sq m of industrial or warehousing I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
- The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land.
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
- It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: psp172/3596</th>
<th>Respondent: 17418401 / Charles Penny</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The initial reason for having floorspace at Garlick’s Arch was because it was further away from the Burnt Common area and increasing the separation between here and the site at Gosden Farm. However putting the floorspace up at Burnt Common further removes the need for Garlick’s Arch.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: psp172/3605</th>
<th>Respondent: 17419297 / Nick Brown</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch

I further object to the Garlicks Arch site because if A58 Burt Common site and development at Gosden Hill Farm is also granted then the A3 corridor from Burpham to Ripley will be over developed and it will simply join up a sprawling set of developments. These in turn will lead to greater traffic density, slower journey times as well as increasing safety concerns for an infrastructure which cannot support this level of traffic.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: psp172/3622</th>
<th>Respondent: 17422881 / Valerie Golding</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: pslp172/3646</td>
<td>Respondent: 17424097 / Marwan Khalek</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT TO A58 at Burnt Common because: this site was deleted from the 2014 Local Plan due to objections yet put back into the 2016 Plan this current proposal looks too increase the development above the 7,000 square meters of warehouse or industrial units proposed in the 2016 Local Plan. There is currently no requirement for more industrial units. Guildford and Slyfield currently have empty sites and there is a decline in the demand for such sites, the 2017 employment land need assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for the whole borough, yet the council are proposing to destroy 10 hectares of Sends GREEN BELT for unnecessary units putting even more pressure on the local roads and adding to the development along the A3 corridor totally against the GREEN BELT policy.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3683</th>
<th>Respondent: 17424705 / Keith Brothwell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the introduction of Policy A58. The creation of “a minimum of 7,000 sqm” of industrial and/or warehouse development in the Burnt Common area is an unnecessary destruction of Green Belt land given the recent decline for industrial land and the empty sites located in Guildford and Slyfield. The existence of Green Belt is to prevent the unrestricted sprawl of urban developments as well as to stop the merging of neighbouring villages and towns. However this plan would join up existing villages, thus defeating these aims. Additionally such a development would cause strain on the small surrounding roads of Ripley and Send, many of which are narrow country lanes.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

I object to policy A58 at Burnt Common - this was deleted from an earlier draft (in 2014) because of all the objections made. Why is it suddenly back on the agenda?

There has been a decline in the demand for industrial land since the first proposal - yet I note that what was proposed as a maximum number in the original plan is now a minimum number!! Reduction in need was demonstrates in the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment - we do not need this huge over allocation of land in our Green Belt.

There are empty sites and industrial units at both Slyfield and Guildford which surely need filling before any further industrial expansion is proposed? I strongly wish our villages to remain in the Green Belt and do not believe there is a need to ruin the area by increasing the industrial property available.

As stated above this proposal aims to link up two distinct village areas which is against the purpose of the Green Belt.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
Policy A58 Land at Burnt Common, London Road

Now a New allocation for a minimum of 7,000 sq.m. of industrial warehousing.

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously.

The word "minimum" is a change from the previous "maximum" in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land.

There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

As with A43 above, the policy will cause small local roads creating traffic gridlock and defeat the object of the Green Belt.

A Waste Management Site is briefly mentioned in policy 4.4.23a and does not allow for proper full and proper consultation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I therefore object to this proposal on the grounds that there is no proven need to allocate any Green Belt land within the Borough for industrial/warehouse development and the fact that, at this particular location, it would have a very severe and adverse environmental impact not only on the two villages, but throughout the whole surrounding area, overdeveloping the local rural communities and creating major traffic problems.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3711  **Respondent:** 17424897 / Peter Sanderson-Byrne  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3735  **Respondent:** 17425569 / Jack Cross  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to this site being included as well as Garlicks Arch.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3752  **Respondent:** 17425889 / Karen Thornton  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a new allocation of 7,000 sq m of industrial or warehousing which was deleted from the 2015 draft. I also object to the wording of the allocation: the 2016 "maximum" allocation of 7,000 sq m has now been changed to "minimum". There are already surplus industrial premises in the borough with Slyfield and Guildford having empty industrial units and sites, also the need for more industrial/warehousing has not been proven. The road infrastructure is inadequate and there are no exceptional reasons to justify development on the green belt. it will also join up surrounding villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**Comment ID:** pslp172/3756  **Respondent:** 17426081 / Robert Yates  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously.
- The word ‘minimum’ is a change from the previous ‘maximum’ in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land.
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
- It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3762  **Respondent:** 17426401 / Kate Legge  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously.
- The word ‘minimum’ is a change from the previous ‘maximum’ in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in the demand for industrial land.
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse developments in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
- It will join up the existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3768  **Respondent:** 17426593 / Darren Moss  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A58 at Burnt Common because:
It was deleted originally in the 2014 draft due to objections received. Why has it now been reintroduced?

There is no need to build industrial/warehouse development on green belt land. Nearby at Slyfield and in Guildford there is availability at both these sites there is simply not the demand for this in the area.

The 2017 employment land need assessment showed a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough. Why a need then for over 10 hectares at Send and in green belt land too.

Again this development will impact on traffic in the village and impact on local infrastructure.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3800  **Respondent:** 17427713 / The Aldertons Farm Residents Company Limited  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

- The proposal for commercial/industrial development on this site is contrary to Green Belt policy.
- There are a number of suitable vacant sites and buildings in Slyfield and Guildford and there is no proven need to develop this essentially farmland site.
- The previous development proposal for this site in the 2014 Draft Local Plan was eventually deleted from that plan due to the objections raised. In the 2016 Draft Local Plan the proposal was re-introduced for a MAXIMUM development of 7000m², however in the current 2017 Draft Local Plan the proposal is for a MINIMUM of 7,000m² which could lead to a vast overdevelopment of the site with resulting negative impact on the quality of the surrounding area and the inevitable increase in traffic problems, particularly when considered with the many local developments currently being put forward in the 2017 Draft Local Plan and as stated above.
- The proposed development would be detrimental to the existing residential properties along this section of the London Road by way of increased noise, traffic, environmental and visual impact, including the potential for parked lorries and trailers when arriving at the site ‘out of hours’.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3803  **Respondent:** 17427777 / Valerie Ann Lazenby  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to Policy A 58, the large development of Burnt Common as there are clearly too many large on these small local roads We are already suffering from the enlarged Vision Engineering works in the village. I object to the latest proposed Local Plan as obviously all our talks and meetings with Council officials have had no impact at all on the proposals being made.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:

- **It was deleted from the 2014 draft** because of all the objections made previously

The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land

There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development **in the middle of the Green Belt** when Slyfield and Guildford still have **empty** sites and industrial units

The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a **reduction** in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a **huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt**

The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock

It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
the resident of both Send and Ripley. There are inadequate transport links (e.g. rail) and the air pollution and safety on local roads will deteriorate, already the main concerns to local residents of Send and Ripley. Any development on this site will increase these issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3893</th>
<th>Respondent: 17434049 / Lucy Starke</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

1. a) The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, … (site allocation A25) [than the Burnt Common site did]”
2. b) The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3896</th>
<th>Respondent: 17434049 / Lucy Starke</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)

The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3938</th>
<th>Respondent: 17434689 / Anya Williamson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A58 change for the following reasons:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft as a direct result of the huge number of objections made previously.
- The parameters of allocation of land for industrial or warehousing use has changed from "a maximum of 7,000 sq m" to "a minimum of 7,000 sq m" in the 2016 plan.
- Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and units. There is no need for this development in the middle of Green Belt land.
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for the whole borough.
- Hence, an allocation of over 10 hectares just at Send in Green Belt land is utterly unnecessary.
- A further increase in traffic would cause gridlock on already busy local roads, and an increase in air pollution and danger to local residents and children.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3942   Respondent: 17434785 / Steve Nicoll   Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Now a new allocation for a minimum of 7,000 sq m of industrial or warehousing

I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously.
- The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land.
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
- It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3966   Respondent: 17440225 / Louisa Scott   Agent:
I object to Policy A58 at Burn Common because:

- It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
- The word minimum is a change from the previous maximum in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in the demand for industrial land
- There is no need to build industrial or warehouse developments in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
- The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt
- The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
- It will join up the existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3982  Respondent: 17440705 / Chris Brown  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58)
The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.
There are clearly serious pollution issues to be considered as well as a massive increase in commercial traffic bringing the waste in and out.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4257  Respondent: 17446113 / Phil Davie  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land around Burnt Common Warehouse (site no. A58)

◦ Outside current development boundary: I OBJECT since this development lies outside the existing development outline of the village. It represents ribbon development, loss of green belt land, and creeping development between Send and Guildford.
◦ Use of Green Belt land: I OBJECT because there are no special or exceptional circumstances identified which justify removal of the Green Belt
◦ Industrial use: I OBJECT to the proposed industrial development of a minimum of 7,000 sq. m at Garlick’s Arch because there is insufficient justification contained within the draft Local Plan plus it is not a sustainable development. It is removed from the major population centres in Guildford and Woking necessitating a large increase in public transport services and/or major additional traffic movements for staff travel and business logistics. If there is a need for 7,000+ sq. m of industrial space within the Borough it should be located at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available, where transport link upgrades are already under way, and where it would be largely welcomed.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4073  Respondent: 17447329 / Justin Rowland  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Policy A58.
Now a new allocation for a minimum of 7,000 sq m of industrial or warehousing
I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common because:

• It was deleted from the 2014 draft because of all the objections made previously
• The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land.
• There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units
• The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 10 hectares at Send in the Green Belt
• The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock
• It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:


Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the
poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4088</th>
<th>Respondent: 17454209 / C E Noble</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This proposed development was deleted from the 2014 Draft Plan because of all the objections made then; it beggars belief that it has now been re-adopted. In the 2016 Plan a "maximum" level of development was proposed. The current document proposes this to be a "minimum" level, despite the fact that since than the level of demand for industrial development land has declined significantly.

The above decline is evidenced by the preponderance of empty development sites and vacant units at Slyfield and Guildford. There is no need to allow further industrial development on Green Belt land.

The 2017 Employment Needs Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land in the Borough as a whole. I can see no justification whatsoever for including an additional 10 hectares of Green Belt land at Send in the current Plan.

As well as flying in the face of Green Belt legislation by helping to join up Send and Ripley, the current proposals will generate traffic levels which current roads are totally inadequate to handle. This will result in serious levels of congestion, if not gridlock.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4123</th>
<th>Respondent: 17455585 / Victor Truscott</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to Policy A58 which was deleted from the 2014 draft, Industrial and Warehousing in this area will have a huge impact on all the local roads. Guildford Borough Council are not in need of more Industrial units as Slyfield Industrial Estate is not used at full capacity so there is no need to build this in the middle of the Green Belt when other Brown site are available.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4139</th>
<th>Respondent: 17456961 / Justine Ayears</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the changes being proposed in and around Burnt Common as this will increase the traffic congestion and increase the strain on the local road network which is already at a severe level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4170</th>
<th>Respondent: 17459617 / Renaissance Classics (Keith Sohl)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The potential for a substantial increase in industrial floor-space from 7000 sq. m. to an unspecified amount at the Site A58 Burnt Common does not provide local residents with enough information for a full and proper consultation given the ambiguity and lack of detail within the document.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely, in policy 4.423a and does not allow for full and proper consultation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4224</th>
<th>Respondent: 17462657 / Malcom Scott</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposal for a Waste Management Facility in Green Belt (A58) The potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned, obscurely in policy 4.423a, and does not allow for full and proper consultation. These facilities are always highly contentious and the Council has a duty of transparency in this regard which it is, at best, neglecting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID:</strong> pslp172/4364  <strong>Respondent:</strong> 17490177 / Fabia Dyer  <strong>Agent:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID:</strong> pslp172/4373  <strong>Respondent:</strong> 17490209 / Elizabeth Ball  <strong>Agent:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site.
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site.

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357 sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607 sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750 sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357 sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357 sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floor space to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floor space and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4438  Respondent: 17490881 / David Smylie  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4481  Respondent: 17491297 / Sonja Freebody  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

11. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

12. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment
defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for
an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of
4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space
than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to
develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately
half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial
space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced
by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the
poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot
apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs
Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use
classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand
dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for
proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4502 Respondent: 17491425 / Moira Maidment Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

C.iii. Policy A58 Burnt Common – My Objections

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial
Strategic Employment Site.
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the
objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has
been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to
build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density
of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt
Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is
double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing
pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline
developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been
consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and
Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land
for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

I object to the potential impact of para 4.4.23a on Burnt Common with its over allocation of industrial zoning is subterfuge for a waste management facility which is a dishonest and underhand approach to planning and proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4496  Respondent: 17491489 / Margaret Perkins  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4532  **Respondent:** 17491745 / Colin Marshall  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is **Sound?** ( ), is **Legally Compliant?** ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4535  Respondent: 17492801 / Stephen Fort  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for
an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of
4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space
than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to
develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately
half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial
space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced
by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the
poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot
apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs
Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use
classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand
dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for
proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4541  Respondent: 17492833 / Helen Marshall  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial
Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the
objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has
been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to
build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density
of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt
Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is
double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing
pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline
developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been
consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and
Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land
for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment
floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for
an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of
4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4561  
Respondent: 17492993 / Jenny Rampe  
Agent:  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floor space defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4571  Respondent: 17493505 / Nigel Simpson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the
poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

15. I object to the potential impact of para 4.4.23a on Burnt Common with its over allocation of industrial zoning is subterfuge for a waste management facility which is a dishonest and underhand approach to planning and proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4576</th>
<th>Respondent: 17493569 / Kim Poysner-Jones</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C.iii. Policy A58 Burnt Common – My Objections

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potentially newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357 sq m.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

15. I object to the potential impact of para 4.4.23a on Burnt Common with its over allocation of industrial zoning is subterfuge for a waste management facility which is a dishonest and underhand approach to planning and proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4625  Respondent: 17494273 / Rosie Wood  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site

2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357 sq m in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”

5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607 sq m of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750 sq m of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357 sq m in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.

14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

15. I object to the potential impact of para 4.4.23a on Burnt Common with its over allocation of industrial zoning is subterfuge for a waste management facility which is a dishonest and underhand approach to planning and proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4649  Respondent: 17494945 / Diana Mulholland  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the
poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4655  **Respondent:** 17495105 / Simon Chambers  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site.
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potentially newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4670  Respondent: 17495393 / Samantha Gilchrist  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site.
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B1a use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
C.iii. Policy A58 Burnt Common – My Objections
I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site

This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.

The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.

There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.“

There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.

The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.

The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”

38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.

The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.

The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.

It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.

The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.

The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4780</th>
<th>Respondent: 17497345 / J.E. Pullen</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. I object to Policy A 58 at Burnt Common and to the proposed inclusion of Burnt Common as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site
2. This previous allocation for B1c, B2 and B8 development was removed from the 2014 draft due to all the objections made previously.
3. The word “minimum” is a change from the previous “maximum” in the 2016 plan and since that time there has been a decline in demand for industrial land. This change alone is unacceptable since even if there was a need to build 7,000 sq m at Burnt Common this development would only require 1.4 ha at a standard plot ratio density of 50% not 9.26 ha. There is no justification for zoning an additional 7.86 ha in the Green Belt.
4. There is in fact no justification for building any more industrial development in the borough particularly at Burnt Common. The current industrial pipeline of granted consents of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space is double the 19,000 sq m said to be needed by Aecom who justify the need for new space on top of the existing pipeline by a completely unsubstantiated suggestion that “there is the possibility that some pipeline developments may not come forward at all, or be developed in different quantities by use class than has been consented.”
5. There is no need to build industrial or warehouse development in the middle of the Green Belt when Slyfield and Guildford still have empty sites and industrial units.
6. The 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand to 3.9 hectares for industrial land for the whole borough not a huge over allocation of 9.26 hectares at Send in the Green Belt.
7. The Employment Land Needs Assessment update 2017 (ELNA) states “that the pipeline for employment floorspace defined by planning permissions yet to be implemented and prior approvals suggests the potential for an additional 33,607sqm of B use class floorspace to come forward. This figure comprises a net loss of 4,750sqm of B1a use class floorspace and a net gain of 38,357sqm in B1c, B2 or B8 use class space.”
8. 38,357 sq m of B1c, B2 or B8 use class is quite sufficient supply for the plan period and is in fact more space than the 3.9 ha of industrial land that is said to be needed for the plan period by Aecom. Since if you were to develop 3.9 ha at a plot ratio of 50% it would provide new industrial development of 19,000 sq m approximately half of current planning permissions granted. This does not justify the need for new development of industrial space on the Green Belt in such areas as Burnt Common.
9. The reality of demand for industrial space is that it is both nationally and locally in decline and this is evidenced by old existing permissions that have not been taken up and developed. The ELNA alludes incorrectly to the poor quality of existing space being a “constraint” on supply and fails to acknowledge that this assertion cannot apply to potential newly developed space e.g. the undeveloped pipeline of 38,357sqm.
10. The impact on small surrounding roads will create traffic gridlock.
11. It will join up existing villages and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
12. The ongoing poor quality of the updated research undertaken by Aecom in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2017 does not support industrial development on land in the Green Belt at Burnt Common.
13. The Aecom research is generally superficial and lacks sufficient detail and analysis between B1c, B2 and B8 use classes and no reliable individual analysis has been undertaken of the widely different supply and demand dynamics of light industrial, general industrial and warehousing and distribution floor space.
14. The potential inclusion of a waste management facility mentioned at paragraph 4.4.23a lacks enough detail for proper consultation and is completely inappropriate.
Total records: 766.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A48 - Land at Home Farm, Effingham
### Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3211</th>
<th>Respondent: 8575617 / Effingham Parish Council (Ian Symes)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A48</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A48 Traveller Site (Effingham)</td>
<td>EPC supports the Traveller site selection of 6 units for Home Farm on the condition it is for local people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/912</th>
<th>Respondent: 8659489 / Helen Bennett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A48</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is very important to monitor travellers sites to prevent them from becoming permanent residences for a small number of people, who are not from the local community. Any informal building or hard landscaping that turns them from temporary travellers pitches into permanent dwellings should be prohibited and vigorously enforced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1216</th>
<th>Respondent: 8729313 / Lisa Wright</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A48</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECT, Site is Greenbelt and should be protected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4621</th>
<th>Respondent: 8817153 / Paul Ives</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A48</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We agree that this policy should be omitted from the Draft Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1007</th>
<th>Respondent: 8848033 / Paul Gerrard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object. It's Green Belt (NPPF 89). Policy E in the NPPF Planning Policy for Travellers document states traveller sites are inappropriate development in the Green Belt, except in very special circumstances. What are the very special circumstances here?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/492</th>
<th>Respondent: 10569473 / Laura Gold</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fully supportive of this policy. The local community has been very supportive in moving this forward. Feel integrated with the local village and the children get on well with local families too. There is a high need for traveller pitches in the area and these 6 pitches will ease the strain in the local area. It will ensure sites are less cramped and will level out provision.

It will provide security and space for children as well as day to day facilities for all. Keen to progress this as quickly as possible to ensure that area can be tidied up and look more respectable. Happy with the split of pitches across 2 areas of land

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/485</th>
<th>Respondent: 10569537 / Kelly King</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fully supportive of this policy. The local community has been very supportive in moving this forward. Feel integrated with the local village and the children get on well with local families too. There is a high need for traveller pitches in the area and these 6 pitches will ease the strain in the local area. It will ensure sites are less cramped and will level out provision.
It will provide security and space for children as well as day to day facilities for all. Keen to progress this as quickly as possible to ensure that area can be tidied up and look more respectable. Happy with the split of pitches across 2 areas of land

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Total records: 7.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A49 - Palm House Nurseries, Normandy
Comment ID: PSLPS16/6583  Respondent: 8591169 / Michael Bruton  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY 49/50

1. For similar reasons I object to land being allocated for development/removal from the Green Belt as follows – A49 (Normandy); A50 (Normandy)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7901  Respondent: 8596673 / Peta Malthouse  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to A49 Land set aside and insetted at Palm Nurseries Site Normandy

This area is to be taken out of green belt and the policy and site are inaccurately described. (See above comments on ‘Consultation’) No ‘exceptional circumstances’ are claimed or can be justified

I object to the use and to the idea of insetting land which is in effect done only to justify use of greenbelt for Traveller pitches. (Advice was obtained to that effect from GL Hearn and has been used to support other policies throughout the Borough.) The land is not accurately described. It is presently occupied by 6 pitches who are licensed on the basis of both personal and temporary permission, given only to allow GBC time to find alternate land to allocate pitches. The Planning Inspector has already commented that this is inappropriate use of the greenbelt. It is not sustainable. The site is not occupied by Travellers but instead sublet mainly to Eastern Europeans. There has been a police raid with firearm use and the Borough Council are or should be aware of who occupies the site and how it is used because it is commonly known in the village and widely known by for instance social services and other service providers. The SOS has already called in an additional plan which sought to add two further pitches which the SOS refused again citing the unsuitability of the site for Travellers. These facts are known to GBC and it is difficult to understand where this additional information can be found within their documentation. There are no exceptional circumstances sufficient to remove this land from the greenbelt.

It is important to note that unlike other Traveller sites there is no suggestion in the policy that this should be preserved for Travellers.

It has no common boundary with any of the previously settled land and sits as an island within green belt as a totally new site. Such development is highly inappropriate. Insetting land for Traveller sites in the greenbelt is a fabrication and construct which cannot be sustained by arguing exceptional circumstances/very special circumstances

Recent case law would show that this part of the plan is unsound and not legal

They are:
In the Solihull BC decision in particular

“Exceptional circumstances are required for any revision of the boundary, whether the proposal is to extend or diminish the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2544  Respondent: 8596673 / Peta Malthouse  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A49
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object most strongly to the proposals that Traveller sites in my areas should be ‘inset’

The traveller sites at land to the rear of Palm House Nurseries [Policy A49] plus the travelling show-people site at Whittles Drive, Guildford Road [Policy A50] are proposed for ‘inset’. At present, where such sites are located in the Green Belt, they are subject to the planning restrictions associated with the Green Belt. ‘Insetting’ will create small islands of ‘urban’ land in the Green Belt which is irrational.

The land at Palm House Nurseries and Green Lane East was identified at appeal by the inspector as contributing to the ‘openness’ of the Green Belt and this argues strongly that it should remain ‘washed over’ by the Green Belt, as all other surrounding land in the submission Local Plan is proposed to remain in the Green Belt.

The traveller sites are all assessed as being located in Green Belt land of “high sensitivity” that is quoted as a main reason Policy A46 and A47 were withdrawn (Sustainability Appraisal 2017, Table 10.1: Commentary on proposed Traveller site allocations, including Green Belt sensitivity) indicating a further argument against ‘inset’ boundaries for such small plots being established in this area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1119  Respondent: 8687041 / Michael Aaronson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A49
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( No ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

This land should not be 'inset' in the Green Belt as it creates an urban enclave that serves to detract from the 'openness' of the village as per the NPPF. This does not constitute the 'exceptional circumstances' that allows Green Belt boundaries to be redrawn.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2659</th>
<th>Respondent: 8687041 / Michael Aaronson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under the revised Plan this Policy/Site is to be inset from the Green Belt. Previously it formed part of a much larger project to remove a huge part of Normandy Ward from the Green Belt. Although the latter development is welcome I object to the insetting of this site along with the other proposed areas to be inset, on the following grounds. First, no case has been made for the 'exceptional circumstances' that are required to remove land from the Green Belt. If this happens it will become much easier in future for developers to make the case for further development in areas adjacent to the 'inset' areas and we will lose our Green Belt by attrition. Second, as recent Planning Inspector judgments have confirmed, the settlements of Normandy and Flexford make an important contribution to the 'openness' of the Green Belt which would be put at risk were they to be 'inset'. The site is rated “High Sensitivity” in the Sustainability Appraisal 2017 (Table 10.1) It should therefore remain 'washed over' by the Green Belt as at present.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1217</th>
<th>Respondent: 8729313 / Lisa Wright</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OBJECT. This site has been through planning numerous times already. it is currently a small site with temporary permission. Please see previous application for details.

OBJECT, Site is Greenbelt and should be protected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7069</th>
<th>Respondent: 8836129 / Roger Shapley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We object to the “insetting” of the land proposed for Policy A49. By proposing to ‘inset’ this site an ‘island’ urban site would be created, removing the ‘openness’ of this Green Belt land confirmed in the judgement of the Planning Inspectorate and similarly judged in the evidence of the GBCS Vol.4. We propose this land should continue to be “washed over”.

Legal Precedent

We object to the removal of the land allocated to Policy A46 by removal from the Green Belt by “inset” under NPPF para 83 and 84. We believe that current case law militates against the removal of land by the re-drawing of Green Belt
boundaries without the express presentation in the written Local Plan of the “exceptional circumstances” proposed to
redraw the Green Belt boundary for the land in Policy A46. We draw attention to the following cases

- Gallagher Homes Ltd v Solihull Borough Council [2014] EWHC 1283 (Admin), Hickinbottom J
- IM Properties Development Ltd v Lichfield DC [2014] EWHC 2440 (Admin), Patterson J
- Calverton Parish Council v Nottingham City Council, Broxtowe Borough Council and Gedling Borough Council
  [2015] EWHC 1078 (Admin), Jay J

In the Solihull BC decision in particular

“Exceptional circumstances are required for any revision of the boundary, whether the proposal is to extend or diminish
the Green Belt. That is the ratio of Carpets of Worth.

Whilst each case is fact-sensitive and the question of whether circumstances are exceptional for these purposes requires
an exercise of planning judgment, what is capable of amounting to exceptional circumstances is a matter of law, and a
plan-maker may err in law if he fails to adopt a lawful approach to exceptional circumstances. Once a Green Belt has
been established and approved, it requires more than general planning concepts to justify an alteration.”

We contend that no “exceptional circumstances “ for such re-drawing of boundaries have been offered by GBC in the
context of the Local Plan process, so how can residents judge the veracity of this proposal?

**Contribution to ‘openness’ of the Green Belt**

There is no legal definition of ‘openness’ but it is specifically expressed in NPPF para. 79 that appears as the first
paragraph in “Section 9 Protecting Green Belt Land”; ‘openness’ is matter of opinion and that opinion is often expressed
in the decisions of Planning Inspectors when assessing a planning appeal.

In the case of Palm House Nurseries the inspector agreed in 2011 that land to the west of Glaziers Lane exhibited
‘openness’. The inspector found in favour of the appellant on other grounds but the opinion on ‘openness’ in those
judgements is evidence that this land around Palm House Nurseries is considered by the Planning Inspectorate to exhibit
‘openness’.

Palm House Nurseries GBC 09/P/01851, Application 12 November 2009 APP/Y3615/A/10/2131590 Decision 24 Feb
2011

“Openness”

The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector’s assessment of the impact of the proposals on the openness of the Green
Belt at IR99-100, and his conclusion at IR101 that there would be considerable harm in this respect. For the reasons given
at IR101, the Secretary of State also agrees with the Inspector’s conclusion that the development would result in some
limited harm to one of the five purposes of including land in the Green Belt identified in PPG2, namely that of assisting
to safeguard the countryside from encroachment (IR101). “

Green Belt & Countryside Study, Vol. 4

In the Green Belt & Countryside Study Vol 4, Land parcel H10 that contains the Palm House Nursery site was judged the
fulfil three essential purposes of the Green Belt

1. Checks sprawl of Normandy
2. Prevents Normandy, Wood Street Village and Flexford from merging
3. Assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
I object. It's Green Belt (NPPF 89). Policy E in the NPPF Planning Policy for Travellers document states traveller sites are inappropriate development in the Green Belt, except in very special circumstances. What are the very special circumstances here?

It is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, and therefore any development is subject to EU/UK legislation (NPPF 119). The impact cannot be avoided with SANGs because there is no evidence base to support SANGs as required by NRM6 viii, NPPF 158 and 166.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

4. I object to Policy A49.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Pages 236-245. Policies A49-A53

Outside of: Outside

Page 243

likely: probably

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to Policy A49, the traveller sites at land to the rear of Palm House Nurseries and Policy 50, the travelling show people site at Whittles Drive, Guildford Road, proposed for ‘inset’ and permanence. By creating new boundaries and “insetting” the two sites they will be two islands of ‘urban land’ in Green Belt. This is inappropriate development. According to NPPF paragraph 89, a council must be able to provide evidence of “exceptional circumstances”. No evidence has been provided, The traveller sites are all assessed as being located in Green Belt land of “high sensitivity”.

I strongly support the removal of Strategic Sites A46 and A47 from the Local Plan because these developments would have destroyed the unique, rural character of Flexford and Normandy irretrievably. In document T3 Sustainability Appraisal 2017 paragraph 10.10.7, Policy 46 would have resulted in the loss of 3a agricultural land, classified as the ‘best and most versatile land’ due to its flexibility, productivity and efficiency in delivering food and non food crops for future generations and benefiting the rural economy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
In the Solihull BC decision in particular

“Exceptional circumstances are required for any revision of the boundary, whether the proposal is to extend or diminish the Green Belt. That is the ratio of Carpets of Worth.

Whilst each case is fact-sensitive and the question of whether circumstances are exceptional for these purposes requires an exercise of planning judgment, what is capable of amounting to exceptional circumstances is a matter of law, and a plan-maker may err in law if he fails to adopt a lawful approach to exceptional circumstances. Once a Green Belt has been established and approved, it requires more than general planning concepts to justify an alteration.”

We contend that no “exceptional circumstances” for such re-drawing of boundaries have been offered by GBC in the context of the Local Plan process, so how can residents judge the veracity of this proposal?

Contribution to ‘openness’ of the Green Belt

There is no legal definition of ‘openness’ but it is specifically expressed in NPPF para. 79 that appears as the first paragraph in “Section 9 Protecting Green Belt Land”; ‘openness’ is matter of opinion and that opinion is often expressed in the decisions of Planning Inspectors when assessing a planning appeal.

In the case of Palm House Nurseries the inspector agreed in 2011 that land to the west of Glaziers Lane exhibited ‘openness’. The inspector found in favour of the appellant on other grounds but the opinion on ‘openness’ in those judgements is evidence that this land around Palm House Nurseries is considered by the Planning Inspectorate to exhibit ‘openness’.

Palm House Nurseries GBC 09/P/01851, Application 12 November 2009 APP/Y3615/A/10/2131590 Decision 24 Feb 2011

“Openness

1. The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector's assessment of the impact of the proposals on the openness of the Green Belt at IR99-100, and his conclusion at IR101 that there would be considerable harm in this respect. For the reasons given at IR101, the Secretary of State also agrees with the Inspector's conclusion that the development would result in some limited harm to one of the five purposes of including land in the Green Belt identified in PPG2, namely that of assisting to safeguard the countryside from encroachment (IR101). ”

Green Belt & Countryside Study, Vol. 4

In the Green Belt & Countryside Study Vol 4, Land parcel H10 that contains the Palm House Nursery site was judged to fulfil three essential purposes of the Green Belt

1. Checks sprawl of Normandy
2. Prevents Normandy, Wood Street Village and Flexford from merging
3. Assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/3429 | Respondent: 10847585 / Sean Meharg | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A49 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |
Palm House Nurseries, Normandy

My understanding was that this plot was given temporary planning approval only. I originally objected because I didn’t want this case to set a precedent for development on green belt land in Normandy. I object again because it appears that, as part of the local plan, there is an intention to ignore those criteria, with the consequence that others can now adopt the same process to get around any planning regulations, knowing they will not be enforced.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3064  Respondent: 10903009 / Ann Messer  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A49

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) is Sound? ( ) is Legally Compliant? ( )

But I am concerned and strongly OBJECT to any future major developments in Guildford Road, the northern end of Glaziers Lane, Flexford, Walden Cottages, and Palm House Nursery Traveller site.

1. The infrastructure in ID1 in the above areas are totally inadequate for further major development and has [illegible word] been improved or added to.
2. The roads are already very congested especially at peak times. Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane are narrow country roads with [illegible word] pavements and 2 dangerous road bridges for heavy vehicles. (I have been told that a new road and footbridge at Ash Station was mentioned over 50 years ago).
3. The electricity supply is not entirely reliable.
4. The drainage is inadequate and [illegible word] to flooding and sewage problems.
5. The medical practice is already fully stretched
6. The village of Normandy is close to the Surrey Hills and the [illegible word] Heathland making it a [illegible word] break between Guildford and Aldershot. Any future development of so many extra homes would make it a continuous building link between the above Towns and destroy the effect of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1252  Respondent: 10911201 / Claire Walker  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A49

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) is Sound? ( ) is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the “inserting” of this land in policy A49. It should not be removed from the green belt. It requires exceptional circumstances for the removal of land from the green belt and none have been shown.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4177  Respondent: 11011777 / Sally Norton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A49
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A49: Land rear of Palm House Nurseries, Normandy
I object to Policy A49
I object to the “insetting” of the land proposed for Policy A49. Proposing to ‘inset’ this site GBC will create an ‘island’ urban site would be created, removing the ‘openness’ of this Green Belt land confirmed in the judgement of the Planning Inspectorate and similarly judged in the evidence of the GBCS Vol.4. I propose this land should continue to be “washed over”.

Legal Precedent
I object to the removal of the land allocated to Policy A49 by removal from the Green Belt by “inset” under NPPF para 83 and 84. I believe that current case law militates against the removal of land by the re-drawing of Green Belt boundaries without the express presentation in the written Local Plan of the “exceptional circumstances” proposed to redraw the Green Belt boundary for the land in Policy A46. I draw attention to the following cases
• Gallagher Homes Ltd v Solihull Borough Council [2014] EWHC 1283 (Admin), Hickinbottom J
• IM Properties Development Ltd v Lichfield DC [2014] EWHC 2440 (Admin), Patterson J
• Calverton Parish Council v Nottingham City Council, Broxtowe Borough Council and Gedling Borough Council [2015] EWHC 1078 (Admin), Jay J
In the Solihull BC decision in particular
“Exceptional circumstances are required for any revision of the boundary, whether the proposal is to extend or diminish the Green Belt. That is the ratio of Carpets of Worth.

Whilst each case is fact-sensitive and the question of whether circumstances are exceptional for these purposes requires an exercise of planning judgment, what is capable of amounting to exceptional circumstances is a matter of law, and a plan-maker may err in law if he fails to adopt a lawful approach to exceptional circumstances. Once a Green Belt has been established and approved, it requires more than general planning concepts to justify an alteration.”
I contend that no “exceptional circumstances “ for such re-drawing of boundaries have been offered by GBC in the context of the Local Plan process, so how can residents judge the veracity of this proposal?

Contribution to ‘openness’ of the Green Belt
There is no legal definition of ‘openness’ but it is specifically expressed in NPPF para. 79 that appears as the first paragraph in “Section 9 Protecting Green Belt Land”; ‘openness’ is matter of opinion and that opinion is often expressed in the decisions of Planning Inspectors when assessing a planning appeal.
In the case of Palm House Nurseries the inspector agreed in 2011 that land to the west of Glaziers Lane exhibited ‘openness’. The inspector found in favour of the appellant on other grounds but the opinion on ‘openness’ in those judgements is evidence that this land around Palm House Nurseries is considered by the Planning Inspectorate to exhibit ‘openness’.
Palm House Nurseries GBC 09/P/01851, Application 12 November 2009 APP/Y3615/A/10/2131590
Decision 24 Feb 2011
“Openness
15. The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector's assessment of the impact of the proposals on the openness of the Green Belt at IR99-100, and his conclusion at IR101 that there would be considerable harm in this respect. For the reasons given at IR101, the Secretary of State also agrees with the Inspector's conclusion that the development would result in some limited harm to one of the five purposes of including land in the Green Belt identified in PPG2, namely that of assisting to safeguard the countryside from encroachment (IR101). “
Green Belt & Countryside Study, Vol. 4
In the Green Belt & Countryside Study Vol 4, Land parcel H10 that contains the Palm House Nursery site was judged the fulfil three essential purposes of the Green Belt
• Checks sprawl of Normandy
• Prevents Normandy, Wood Street Village and Flexford from merging
• Assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
I object to Policy A49
I object to the “insetting” of the land proposed for Policy A49. By proposing to ‘inset’ this site an ‘island’ urban site would be created, removing the ‘openness’ of this Green Belt land confirmed in the judgement of the Planning Inspectorate and similarly judged in the evidence of the GBCS Vol.4. I propose this land should continue to be “washed over”.

Legal Precedent
I object to the removal of the land allocated to Policy A49 by removal from the Green Belt by “inset” under NPPF para 83 and 84. I believe that current case law militates against the removal of land by the re-drawing of Green Belt boundaries without the express presentation in the written Local Plan of the “exceptional circumstances” proposed to redraw the Green Belt boundary for the land in Policy A46. I draw attention to the following cases
• Gallagher Homes Ltd v Solihull Borough Council [2014] EWHC 1283 (Admin), Hickinbottom J
• IM Properties Development Ltd v Lichfield DC [2014] EWHC 2440 (Admin), Patterson J
• Calverton Parish Council v Nottingham City Council, Broxtowe Borough Council and Gedling Borough Council [2015] EWHC 1078 (Admin), Jay J

In the Solihull BC decision in particular
“Exceptional circumstances are required for any revision of the boundary, whether the proposal is to extend or diminish the Green Belt. That is the ratio of Carpets of Worth. Whilst each case is fact-sensitive and the question of whether circumstances are exceptional for these purposes requires an exercise of planning judgment, what is capable of amounting to exceptional circumstances is a matter of law, and a plan-maker may err in law if he fails to adopt a lawful approach to exceptional circumstances. Once a Green Belt has been established and approved, it requires more than general planning concepts to justify an alteration.”

I contend that no “exceptional circumstances “ for such re-drawing of boundaries have been offered by GBC in the context of the Local Plan process, so how can residents judge the veracity of this proposal?

Contribution to ‘openness’ of the Green Belt
There is no legal definition of ‘openness’ but it is specifically expressed in NPPF para. 79 that appears as the first paragraph in “Section 9 Protecting Green Belt Land”; ‘openness’ is matter of opinion and that opinion is often expressed in the decisions of Planning Inspectors when assessing a planning appeal.

In the case of Palm House Nurseries the inspector agreed in 2011 that land to the west of Glaziers Lane exhibited ‘openness’. The inspector found in favour of the appellant on other grounds but the opinion on ‘openness’ in those judgements is evidence that this land around Palm House Nurseries is considered by the Planning Inspectorate to exhibit ‘openness’.

Palm House Nurseries GBC 09/P/01851, Application 12 November 2009 APP/Y3615/A/10/2131590 Decision 24 Feb 2011

“Openness
15. The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector's assessment of the impact of the proposals on the openness of the Green Belt at IR99-100, and his conclusion at IR101 that there would be considerable harm in this respect. For the reasons given at IR101, the Secretary of State also agrees with the Inspector's conclusion that the development would result in some limited harm to one of the five purposes of including land in the Green Belt identified in PPG2, namely that of
 assisting to safeguard the countryside from encroachment (IR101). “
In the Green Belt & Countryside Study Vol 4, Land parcel H10 that contains the Palm House Nursery site was judged the fulfil three essential purposes of the Green Belt
• Checks sprawl of Normandy
• Prevents Normandy, Wood Street Village and Flexford from merging
• Assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A50 - Land at Whittles Drive, Aldershot Road, Normandy
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Comment ID: pslp172/4264  Respondent: 8593537 / Normandy Parish Council (Leslie GA Clarke)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A50

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Traveller site at Palm House Nurseries (Policy/Site A49) and Travelling Show-people site at Whittles Drive (Policy/Site A50)

The Parish Council especially objects to the Traveller site at Palm House Nurseries (Site A49) and the travelling Show-people site at Whittles Drive (Site A50) being made permanent and inset from the Green Belt.

7. At a previous planning appeal the Inspector stated that the land at Palm House Nurseries contributes to the openness of the Green Belt and because of this the Parish Council feels strongly that it should remain ‘washed over’. We understand that Travellers already own the adjacent land; if their existing site is ‘inset’ we fear there will be an attempt to enlarge the site onto this land even though it remains in the Green Belt (see comments above in para 3). The same arguments apply to the Travelling Show-people site at Whittles Drive. Both sites are rated “High Sensitivity” in the Sustainability Appraisal 2017 (Table 10.1) and in the Parish Council’s view this flies in the face of allowing them to be ‘inset’ from the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7902  Respondent: 8596673 / Peta Malthouse  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A50

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A50 Whittles Drive, Guildford Road, Normandy

I object to the “insetting” of the land proposed for Policy A50. By proposing to ‘inset’ this site an ‘island’ urban site would be created, removing the ‘openness’ of this Green Belt land confirmed in the judgement of the Planning Inspectorate and similarly judged in the evidence of the GBCS Vol.4. I propose this land should continue to be “washed over”. For all the above (Re Palm Nurseries) and for these reasons I consider this part of the plan not to be sound or legal

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1120  Respondent: 8687041 / Michael Aaronson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A50

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( No ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )
This land should not be 'inset' in the Green Belt as it creates an urban enclave that serves to detract from the 'openness' of the village as per the NPPF. This does not constitute the 'exceptional circumstances' that allows Green Belt boundaries to be redrawn.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. **The Plan is self-inconsistent in respect of traveller sites.**
   A50 Whittles Drive, Normandy, shows on the Site details: “Allocation: The site is allocated for approximately 14 Travelling Showpeople plots ...” Clearly A50 more than covers the total “need” of 8, (page 40, 4.2.22.) and so no “need” exists for this in site A43. This and other inconsistencies in the Plan mean no decision can be made on the basis of this document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Plan is self-inconsistent in respect of traveller sites. A50 Whittles Drive, Normandy, shows on the Site details: “Allocation: The site is allocated for approximately 14 Travelling Showpeople plots …” Clearly A50 more than covers the total “need” of 8, (page 40, 4.2.22.) and so no “need” exists for this in site A43. This and other inconsistencies in the Plan mean no decision can be made on the basis of this document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7070  Respondent: 8836129 / Roger Shapley  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We object to the “insetting” of the land proposed for Policy A50. By proposing to ‘inset’ this site an ‘island’ urban site would be created, removing the ‘openness’ of this Green Belt land confirmed in the judgement of the Planning Inspectorate and similarly judged in the evidence of the GBCS Vol.4. We propose this land should continue to be “washed over”.

Legal Precedent

We object to the removal of the land allocated to Policy A46 by removal from the Green Belt by “inset” under NPPF para 83 and 84. We believe that current case law militates against the removal of land by the re-drawing of Green Belt boundaries without the express presentation in the written Local Plan of the “exceptional circumstances” proposed to redraw the Green Belt boundary for the land in Policy A46. We draw attention to the following cases

- Gallagher Homes Ltd v Solihull Borough Council [2014] EWHC 1283 (Admin), Hickinbottom J
- IM Properties Development Ltd v Lichfield DC [2014] EWHC 2440 (Admin), Patterson J

In the Solihull BC decision in particular

“Exceptional circumstances are required for any revision of the boundary, whether the proposal is to extend or diminish the Green Belt. That is the ratio of Carpets of Worth.

Whilst each case is fact-sensitive and the question of whether circumstances are exceptional for these purposes requires an exercise of planning judgment, what is capable of amounting to exceptional circumstances is a matter of law, and a plan-maker may err in law if he fails to adopt a lawful approach to exceptional circumstances. Once a Green Belt has been established and approved, it requires more than general planning concepts to justify an alteration.”

We contend that no “exceptional circumstances” for such re-drawing of boundaries have been offered by GBC in the context of the Local Plan process, so how can residents judge the veracity of this proposal?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1022  Respondent: 9009153 / Lindsay Mitchell  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We object to the “insetting” of the land proposed for Policy A50. By proposing to ‘inset’ this site an ‘island’ urban site would be created, removing the ‘openness’ of this Green Belt land confirmed in the judgement of the Planning Inspectorate and similarly judged in the evidence of the GBCS Vol.4. We propose this land should continue to be “washed over”.

Legal Precedent

We object to the removal of the land allocated to Policy A46 by removal from the Green Belt by “inset” under NPPF para 83 and 84. We believe that current case law militates against the removal of land by the re-drawing of Green Belt boundaries without the express presentation in the written Local Plan of the “exceptional circumstances” proposed to redraw the Green Belt boundary for the land in Policy A46. We draw attention to the following cases

- Gallagher Homes Ltd v Solihull Borough Council [2014] EWHC 1283 (Admin), Hickinbottom J
- IM Properties Development Ltd v Lichfield DC [2014] EWHC 2440 (Admin), Patterson J

In the Solihull BC decision in particular

“Exceptional circumstances are required for any revision of the boundary, whether the proposal is to extend or diminish the Green Belt. That is the ratio of Carpets of Worth.

Whilst each case is fact-sensitive and the question of whether circumstances are exceptional for these purposes requires an exercise of planning judgment, what is capable of amounting to exceptional circumstances is a matter of law, and a plan-maker may err in law if he fails to adopt a lawful approach to exceptional circumstances. Once a Green Belt has been established and approved, it requires more than general planning concepts to justify an alteration.”

We contend that no “exceptional circumstances” for such re-drawing of boundaries have been offered by GBC in the context of the Local Plan process, so how can residents judge the veracity of this proposal?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The Plan is self-inconsistent in respect of traveller sites.
A50 Whittles Drive, Normandy, shows on the Site details: “Allocation: The site is allocated for approximately 14 Travelling Showpeople plots …” Clearly A50 more than covers the total “need” of 8, (page 40, 4.2.22.) and so no “need” exists for this in site A43. This and other inconsistencies in the Plan mean no decision can be made on the basis of this document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1142  Respondent: 9437921 / Grace Ashby  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A50
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Concern about the location off the main road. There was a fatal car accident very close to this proposed site and another car ran off the road. There is already 2 traveller sites further up the road less than half a mile away. At this existing site - the roadside oak trees were destroyed a dangerous access onto the road created and permanent homes. Anything of the same on this site would destroy the local environment, and be lethal.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1160  Respondent: 10616321 / Petrina Jeffreson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A50
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Plan is self-inconsistent in respect of traveller sites.
A50 Whittles Drive, Normandy, shows on the Site details: “Allocation: The site is allocated for approximately 14 Travelling Showpeople plots …” Clearly A50 more than covers the total "need" of 8, (page 40, 4.2.22.) and so no “need” exists for this in site A43. This and other inconsistencies in the Plan mean no decision can be made on the basis of this document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4217  Respondent: 10638209 / Wendy Rockhill  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A50
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
The Plan contains inconsistencies in respect of traveller sites.
A50 Whittles Drive, Normandy, shows on the Site details: “Allocation: The site is allocated for approximately 14 Travelling Showpeople plots …” Clearly A50 more than covers the total assessed “need” of 8 places, (page 40, 4.2.22.) and so no “need” exists for this in site A34. This and other inconsistencies in the Plan mean no decision can be made on the basis of this document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1668   Respondent: 10701537 / Ben Gamble   Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A50
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Plan is self-inconsistent in respect of traveller sites. A50 Whittles Drive, Normandy, shows on the Site details: “Allocation: The site is allocated for approximately 14 Travelling Showpeople plots …” Clearly A50 more than covers the total “need” of 8, (page 40, 4.2.22.) and so no “need” exists for this in site A43. This and other inconsistencies in the Plan mean no decision can be made on the basis of this document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7943   Respondent: 10799425 / Guildford Greenbelt Group (Susan Parker)   Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A50
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A50 Whittles Drive, Guildford Road, Normandy
Response – GGG objects to this policy
Do you consider this section of the plan legally compliant?   NO
Do you consider this section of the plan is sound?   NO
Do you consider this section of the document complies with the Duty to Cooperate?   YES

We object to the “insetting” of the land proposed for Policy A50. By proposing to ‘inset’ this site an ‘island’ urban site would be created, removing the ‘openness’ of this Green Belt land confirmed in the judgement of the Planning Inspectorate and similarly judged in the evidence of the GBCS Vol.4. We propose this land should continue to be “washed over”.

Legal Precedent

We object to the removal of the land allocated to Policy A46 by removal from the Green Belt by “inset” under NPPF para 83 and 84. We believe that current case law militates against the removal of land by the re-drawing of Green Belt
boundaries without the express presentation in the written Local Plan of the “exceptional circumstances” proposed to redraw the Green Belt boundary for the land in Policy A46. We draw attention to the following cases:

- **Gallagher Homes Ltd v Solihull Borough Council [2014] EWHC 1283 (Admin), Hickinbottom J**
- **IM Properties Development Ltd v Lichfield DC [2014] EWHC 2440 (Admin), Patterson J**
- **Calverton Parish Council v Nottingham City Council, Broxtowe Borough Council and Gedling Borough Council [2015] EWHC 1078 (Admin), Jay J**

In the Solihull BC decision in particular

“Exceptional circumstances are required for any revision of the boundary, whether the proposal is to extend or diminish the Green Belt. That is the ratio of Carpets of Worth.

Whilst each case is fact-sensitive and the question of whether circumstances are exceptional for these purposes requires an exercise of planning judgment, what is capable of amounting to exceptional circumstances is a matter of law, and a plan-maker may err in law if he fails to adopt a lawful approach to exceptional circumstances. Once a Green Belt has been established and approved, it requires more than general planning concepts to justify an alteration.”

We contend that no “exceptional circumstances “ for such re-drawing of boundaries have been offered by GBC in the context of the Local Plan process, so how can residents judge the veracity of this proposal?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1705</th>
<th>Respondent: 10818529 / John Hales</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A50</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **The Plan is self-inconsistent in respect of traveller sites.**

   A50 Whittles Drive, Normandy, shows on the Site details: “Allocation: The site is allocated for approximately 14 Travelling Showpeople plots …” Clearly A50 more than covers the total “need” of 8, (page 40, 4.2.22.) and so no “need” exists for this in site A43. This and other inconsistencies in the Plan mean no decision can be made on the basis of this document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3152</th>
<th>Respondent: 10828737 / Claire Dawson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A50</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Plan itself is inconsistent in respect of traveller sites. A50 Whittles Drive, Normandy, shows on the Site details: “Allocation: The site is allocated for approximately 14 Travelling Showpeople plots …” Clearly A50 more than covers...
the total "need" of 8, (page 40, 4.2.22.) and therefore there is no “need” for the provision regarding the site A43 Garlicks Arch. This and other inconsistencies in the Plan mean no decision can be made on the basis of this document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/844  Respondent: 10906145 / Joe Gervasio  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A50
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Plan is self-inconsistent in respect of traveller sites.
A50 Whittles Drive, Normandy, shows on the Site details: “Allocation: The site is allocated for approximately 14 Travelling Showpeople plots …” Clearly A50 more than covers the total "need" of 8, page 40, 4.2.22. and so no “need” exists for this in site A43. This and other inconsistencies in the Plan mean no decision can be made on the basis of this document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2440  Respondent: 10910753 / Heather Thompson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A50
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Plan is self-inconsistent in respect of traveller sites.
A50 Whittles Drive, Normandy, shows on the Site details: “Allocation: The site is allocated for approximately 14 Travelling Showpeople plots …” Clearly A50 more than covers the total "need" of 8, (page 40, 4.2.22.) and so no “need” exists for this in site A43. This and other inconsistencies in the Plan mean no decision can be made on the basis of this document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1255  Respondent: 10911201 / Claire Walker  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A50
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the insetting of this land in A50 policy. For land to be removed from the Green Belt exceptional circumstances must be shown and none have been.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
The Plan is self-inconsistent in respect of traveller sites. A50 Whittles Drive, Normandy, shows on the Site details: “Allocation: The site is allocated for approximately 14 Travelling Showpeople plots ...” Clearly A50 more than covers the total "need" of 8, (page 40, 4.2.22.) and so no “need” exists for this in site A43. This and other inconsistencies in the Plan mean no decision can be made on the basis of this document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Policy A50 Whittles Drive, Guildford Road, Normandy
I object to Policy A50
I object to the “insetting” of the land proposed for Policy A50. By proposing to ‘inset’ this site an ‘island’ urban site would be created, removing the ‘openness’ of this Green Belt land confirmed in the judgement of the Planning Inspectorate and similarly judged in the evidence of the GBCS Vol.4. I propose this land should continue to be “washed over”.
Legal Precedent
I object to the removal of the land allocated to Policy A50 by removal from the Green Belt by “inset” under NPPF para 83 and 84. I believe that current case law militates against the removal of land by the re-drawing of Green Belt boundaries without the express presentation in the written
Local Plan of the “exceptional circumstances” proposed to redraw the Green Belt boundary for the land in Policy A46. I draw attention to the following cases

- Gallagher Homes Ltd v Solihull Borough Council [2014] EWHC 1283 (Admin), Hickinbottom J
- IM Properties Development Ltd v Lichfield DC [2014] EWHC 2440 (Admin), Patterson J

In the Solihull BC decision in particular

“Exceptional circumstances are required for any revision of the boundary, whether the proposal is to extend or diminish the Green Belt. That is the ratio of Carpets of Worth. Whilst each case is fact-sensitive and the question of whether circumstances are exceptional for these purposes requires an exercise of planning judgment, what is capable of amounting to exceptional circumstances is a matter of law, and a plan-maker may err in law if he fails to adopt a lawful approach to exceptional circumstances. Once a Green Belt has been established and approved, it requires more than general planning concepts to justify an alteration.”

I contend that no “exceptional circumstances “ for such re-drawing of boundaries have been offered by GBC in the context of the Local Plan process, so how can residents judge the veracity of this proposal?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1084  **Respondent:** 11039681 / Bruce Jeffreson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A50

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Plan is self-inconsistent in respect of traveller sites.

A50 Whittles Drive, Normandy, shows on the Site details: “Allocation: The site is allocated for approximately 14 Travelling Showpeople plots ...” Clearly A50 more than covers the total "need" of 8, (page 40, 4.2.22.) and so no “need” exists for this in site A43. This and other inconsistencies in the Plan mean no decision can be made on the basis of this document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2302  **Respondent:** 15114721 / Leslie Macnair  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A50

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Plan is self-inconsistent in respect of traveller sites.

A50 Whittles Drive, Normandy, shows on the Site details: “Allocation: The site is allocated for approximately 14 Travelling Showpeople plots ...” Clearly A50 more than covers the total "need" of 8, (page 40, 4.2.22.) and so no “need” exists for this in site A43. This and other inconsistencies in the Plan mean no decision can be made on the basis of this document.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1009</th>
<th>Respondent: 15136513 / Ian Mitchell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A50</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Plan is self-inconsistent in respect of traveller sites. A50 Whittles Drive, Normandy, shows on the Site details: “Allocation: The site is allocated for approximately 14 Travelling Showpeople plots ...” Clearly A50 more than covers the total "need" of 8, (page 40, 4.2.22.) and so no “need” exists for this in site A43. This and other inconsistencies in the Plan mean no decision can be made on the basis of this document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1371</th>
<th>Respondent: 15248481 / Jamie McCallister</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A50</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Plan is self-inconsistent in respect of traveller sites. A50 Whittles Drive, Normandy, shows on the Site details: “Allocation: The site is allocated for approximately 14 Travelling Showpeople plots ...” Clearly A50 more than covers the total "need" of 8, (page 40, 4.2.22.) and so no “need” exists for this in site A43. This and other inconsistencies in the Plan mean no decision can be made on the basis of this document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1241</th>
<th>Respondent: 15406145 / Paul Moore</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A50</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Plan is self-inconsistent in respect of traveller sites. A50 Whittles Drive, Normandy, shows on the Site details: “Allocation: The site is allocated for approximately 14 Travelling Showpeople plots ...” Clearly A50 more than covers the total "need" of 8, (page 40, 4.2.22.) and so no “need” exists for this in site A43. This and other inconsistencies in the Plan mean no decision can be made on the basis of this document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
The Plan is self-inconsistent in respect of traveller sites.
A50 Whittles Drive, Normandy, shows on the Site details: “Allocation: The site is allocated for approximately 14 Travelling Showpeople plots …” Clearly A50 more than covers the total “need” of 8, (page 40, 4.2.22.) and so no “need” exists for this in site A43. This and other inconsistencies in the Plan mean no decision can be made on the basis of this document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to Policy A50. I object to the “insetting” of the land proposed for Policy A50. By proposing to ‘inset’ this site an ‘island’ urban site would be created, removing the ‘openness’ of this Green Belt land confirmed in the judgement of the Planning Inspectorate and similarly judged in the evidence of the GBCS Vol.4. I propose this land should continue to be “washed over”.

Legal Precedent
I object to the removal of the land allocated to Policy A50 by removal from the Green Belt by “inset” under NPPF para 83 and 84. I believe that current case law militates against the removal of land by the re-drawing of Green Belt boundaries without the express presentation in the written Local Plan of the “exceptional circumstances” proposed to redraw the Green Belt boundary for the land in Policy A46. I draw attention to the following cases

• Gallagher Homes Ltd v Solihull Borough Council [2014] EWHC 1283 (Admin), Hickinbottom J
• IM Properties Development Ltd v Lichfield DC [2014] EWHC 2440 (Admin), Patterson J
• Calverton Parish Council v Nottingham City Council, Broxtowe Borough Council and Gedling Borough Council [2015] EWHC 1078 (Admin), Jay J

In the Solihull BC decision in particular “Exceptional circumstances are required for any revision of the boundary, whether the proposal is to extend or diminish the Green Belt. That is the ratio of Carpets of Worth. Whilst each case is fact-sensitive and the question of whether circumstances are exceptional for these purposes requires an exercise of planning judgment, what is capable of amounting to exceptional circumstances is a matter of law, and a plan-maker may err in law if he fails to adopt a lawful approach to exceptional circumstances. Once a Green Belt has been established and approved, it requires more than general planning concepts to justify an alteration.”

I contend that no “exceptional circumstances” for such re-drawing of boundaries have been offered by GBC in the context of the Local Plan process, so how can residents judge the veracity of this proposal?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The Plan is self-inconsistent in respect of traveller sites.
A50 Whittles Drive, Normandy, shows on the Site details: “Allocation: The site is allocated for approximately 14 Travelling Showpeople plots …” Clearly A50 more than covers the total “need” of 8, (page 40, 4.2.22.) and so no “need” exists for this in site A43. This and other inconsistencies in the Plan mean no decision can be made on the basis of this document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference number</th>
<th>Name of site</th>
<th>Nearest town</th>
<th>Development description</th>
<th>Woodland adjacent or within?</th>
<th>Type of woodland affected (e.g. ASNW, PAWS, secondary) &amp; grid reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A50</td>
<td>Land at Whittle’s Drive, Aldershot Road, Normandy</td>
<td>Normandy</td>
<td>“The site is allocated for approximately 14 Travelling Showpeople plots (sui generis)”</td>
<td>Adjacent</td>
<td>Unnamed ASNW, SU942525 Island Copse PAWS, SU943526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3654  Respondent: 15689953 / Environment Agency (Oliver Rathmill)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A50

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3.1.2 Assessment of climate change

Within your plan the following four sites are based on high level flood risk information:

POLICY A39: Land near Horsley railway station, Ockham Road, North, East Horsley (assessment based on Flood Zones)
POLICY A40: Land to the north of West Horsley (assessment based on Flood Zones)
POLICY A50: Land at Whittle's Drive, Aldershot Road, Normandy (assessment based on Flood Zones)
POLICY A54: Lakeview, Lakeside Road, Ash Vale (assessment based on detailed flood model (Blackwater 2007) 1 in 100 year flood)

Although you have deemed these to have passed the flood risk sequential test as noted below we would expect that at planning application stage detailed flood modelling is undertaken.

We note that the new climate change allowances haven’t been specifically mentioned in the Level 2 SFRA or local plan. However, the majority of allocated sites have detailed modelling where the 1 in 1000 year (0.1% annual exceedance probability) is available, these sites have been assessed against the 1 in 1000 year flood. For the purpose of accuracy and clarity we recommend that this approach of using the 1 in 1000 year flood event to account for climate change is clearly set out in the SFRA Level 2.

If these sites are adopted, at the planning application stage we would expect an assessment of climate change (using the new allowances) to be undertaken by applicants. We recommend applicants consult with the most recent national climate change guidance including our Thames Climate change guidance.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1093  Respondent: 17241889 / John Hackney  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A50
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1202</th>
<th>Respondent: 17247169 / Ben Greaves</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Plan is self-inconsistent in respect of traveller sites. A50 Whittles Drive, Normandy, shows on the Site details: “Allocation: The site is allocated for approximately 14 Travelling Showpeople plots…” Clearly A50 more than covers the total “need” of 8, (page 40, 4.2.22.) and so no “need” exists for this in site A43. This and other inconsistencies in the Plan mean no decision can be made on the basis of this document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1260</th>
<th>Respondent: 17249601 / Penelope Moore</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Plan is self-inconsistent in respect of traveller sites. A50 Whittles Drive, Normandy, shows on the Site details: "Allocation: The site is allocated for approximately 14 Travelling Showpeople plots…” Clearly A50 more than covers the total "need" of 8, (page 40, 4.2.22.) and so no “need” exists for this in site A43. This and other inconsistencies in the Plan mean no decision can be made on the basis of this document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1359</th>
<th>Respondent: 17256577 / Tina Makin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Plan is self-inconsistent in respect of traveller sites. A50 Whittles Drive, Normandy, shows on the Site details: “Allocation: The site is allocated for approximately 14 Travelling Showpeople plots…” Clearly A50 more than covers the total "need" of 8, (page 40, 4.2.22.) and so no “need” exists for this in site A43. This and other inconsistencies in the Plan mean no decision can be made on the basis of this document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1898  Respondent: 17291553 / James Hitchings  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Comment ID: pslp172/1969  Respondent: 17293025 / Donna Deam  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Comment ID: pslp172/2264  Respondent: 17302497 / F Bennett  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
The Plan is self-inconsistent in respect of traveller sites. A50 Whittles Drive, Normandy, shows on the Site details: “Allocation: The site is allocated for approximately 14 Travelling Showpeople plots …” Clearly A50 more than covers the total “need” of 8, (page 40, 4.2.22.) and so no “need” exists for this in site A43. This and other inconsistencies in the Plan mean no decision can be made on the basis of this document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2318  **Respondent:** 17303745 / Christine M Macnair  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A50

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2500  **Respondent:** 17316257 / Neeley Jackson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A50

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3110  **Respondent:** 17392513 / Katherine Aaronson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A50

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am concerned that huge extensions to settlement boundaries are being proposed in many villages, as well as infilling outside of settlement boundaries in a further 11 villages. I object on both counts.
I strongly object to the proposed ‘insetting’ of the settlements at Normandy, Flexford and Walden Cottages, as well as of the Travelling Show-people site at Whittles Drive (Policy/Site A50) and of the Traveller site at Palm House Nurseries (Policy/Site A49). These sites contribute to the openness of the Green Belt (as evidenced in past planning appeals APP/Y3615/W/15/3002308, APP/Y3615/A/10/2140630 and APP/Y3615/A/10/2131590). Furthermore, as per paragraph 10.7.7 of the Sustainability Assessment the agricultural land between these settlements demonstrates ‘openness’ and makes an important contribution to the rural economy. In addition, land in and around the Flexford and Normandy settlements helps maintain views into and from the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty at the Hog’s Back.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Total records: 46.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A51 - Land at Cobbetts Close, Worplesdon
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1009</th>
<th>Respondent: 8848033 / Paul Gerrard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object. It's Green Belt (NPPF 89). Policy E in the NPPF Planning Policy for Travellers document states traveller sites are inappropriate development in the Green Belt, except in very special circumstances. What are the very special circumstances here?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, and therefore any development is subject to EU/UK legislation (NPPF 119). The impact cannot be avoided with SANGs because there is no evidence base to support SANGs as required by NRM6 viii, NPPF 158 and 166.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/141</th>
<th>Respondent: 10903073 / HEINE PLANNING (ALISON HEINE)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struggle to see how this can be shown as providing 20 new pitches when 17 are existing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total records: 2.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A52 - Four Acre Stables, Aldershot Road, Worplesdon
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/6239 | Respondent: 8727457 / Nuala Crampin | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A52 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |

A52 and A53 Four Acres, Aldershot Road and Land to the rear of Roundabout White Hart Lane

The North-West area of Guildford has more than its fair share of Traveller sites and indeed the borough has more than comparable boroughs so further provision is not appropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/7618 | Respondent: 8728865 / Neville Bryan | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A52 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |

Object

DCLG changes to NPPF / NPPG regards the applications and management of traveller applications needs to be applied. This is a small site which meets all criteria of the Greenbelt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/1218 | Respondent: 8729313 / Lisa Wright | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A52 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |

OBJECT, Site is Greenbelt and should be protected.

No special circumstances are given by GBC to allow this expansion.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/1010 | Respondent: 8848033 / Paul Gerrard | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A52 |
I object. It's Green Belt (NPPF 89). Policy E in the NPPF Planning Policy for Travellers document states traveller sites are inappropriate development in the Green Belt, except in very special circumstances. What are the very special circumstances here?

It is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, and therefore any development is subject to EU/UK legislation (NPPF 119). The impact cannot be avoided with SANGs because there is no evidence base to support SANGs as required by NRM6 viii, NPPF 158 and 166.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Total records: 6.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A53 - Roundoak, White Hart Lane, Wood Street Village
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5716</th>
<th>Respondent: 8706625 / Hilary Barker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to this site being in the Local Plan:

- This site is in the Metropolitan Green Belt and should be returned to a private garden. Planning policy for traveller sites (PPTS) Policy E states that “Traveller sites are inappropriate development within the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.”
- The Traveller family who moved onto this site and applied for retrospective planning permission were granted a five year stay at appeal only until GBC provided them with a pitch in the area. As they must be top of the list for relocating, they should be allocated one of the 3 new pitches proposed for Cobbetts Close or Four Acres Stables or one of 17 new pitches at Hatchingtan - Burdenshott Road.

SANGS

I OBJECT strongly to GBC creating SANGS so that they can justify building developments within 5 km

- Russell Place Farm – Frog Grove Lane
- Broad Street Common and Backside Common
- Blackwell Farm
- Stringer’s Common
- Burpham Court Farm

**Definition of a SANG:** Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space.

- The role of a SANG is to divert visitors from visiting the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area – SPA.

**Worplesdon incorporates Whitmoor Common**

- A SANG must provide a similar quality of experience as the SPA -be more attractive to visitors than the SPA.
- They should provide biodiversity, access, landscape character and wildlife.

GRA suggested in the consultation of the Issues and Options in 2013 that:

“A SANG needs to ensure that it can provide genuinely new opportunities for informal recreation in newly created areas of high potential wildlife value rather than simply a rebranding of areas already enjoyed by residents.

- SANGS are being created in Worplesdon in order to detract people away from Whitmoor Common SPA, SSSI, LNR. There is no proof that SANGS work. GBC will have to provide legal proof.
- They are also being created to allow developers to build extensively within a 5km radius of a SANG – this would allow for building in Normandy, Wood Street, Fairlands.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/4367 | Respondent: 8728865 / Neville Bryan | Agent: |
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Object

This is greenbelt, meeting all purposes of the greenbelt.

DCLG changes to NPPF / NPPG regards the applications and management of traveller applications needs to be applied.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7619  Respondent: 8728865 / Neville Bryan   Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Object

DCLG changes to NPPF / NPPG regards the applications and management of traveller applications needs to be applied.

This is a small site which meets all criteria of the Greenbelt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1219  Respondent: 8729313 / Lisa Wright   Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

OBJECT. Site is greenbelt and should be protected.

Again, there is much planning history with this site which you may wish to consider.

No special circumstances exist to warrant removing this land from Greenbelt status

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3824  Respondent: 9042753 / Julia Trinick   Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the inset of a traveller site in Wood Street Village as this has been refused by 'Planning'.

Any insetting in retrospect is wrong and is purely devised to give permission to an illegal development on Greenbelt that has had previously been refused by the Council.

Any suggestion that this development maintains the openness of Greenbelt is mistaken.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Total records: 5.
Document part: Policy A54 - Lakeview, Lakeside Road, Ash Vale

No representations received for this section.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A55 - The Orchard, Puttenham Heath Road, Puttenham
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1220  **Respondent:** 8729313 / Lisa Wright  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A55

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

OBJECT. This site is AONB and therefore deserves the upmost protection.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7245  **Respondent:** 8839041 / Jon Maslin  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A55

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the removal of land from Greenbelt for the provision of two traveler pitches on Puttenham Heath Road to 'enable delivery'. The area warrants Green belt status and should remain in Green Belt. Removal is a big step towards the eventual development of permanent accommodation, which would result in loss of the two pitches.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7158  **Respondent:** 10859553 / MARK Curtis  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A55

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A55

I object to the removal of land from Greenbelt for the provision of two traveler pitches on Puttenham Heath Road to 'enable delivery'. The area warrants Green belt status and should remain in Green Belt. Removal is a big step towards the eventual development of permanent accommodation, which would result in loss of the two pitches.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6699  **Respondent:** 11036289 / Osman Abdullah  **Agent:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6749</th>
<th>Respondent: 11080097 / David &amp; Julia Hunt</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the removal of land from Greenbelt for the provision of two traveler pitches on Puttenham Heath Road to 'enable delivery'. The area warrants Green belt status and should remain in Green Belt. Removal is a big step towards the eventual development of permanent accommodation, which would result in loss of the two pitches.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1248</th>
<th>Respondent: 15275009 / Compton Parish Council (Fiona Curtis)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY A55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We object to the removal of land from Greenbelt for the provision of two traveler pitches on Puttenham Heath Road to 'enable delivery'. The area warrants Green belt status and should remain in Green Belt. Removal is a big step towards the eventual development of permanent accommodation, which would result in loss of the two pitches.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6718</th>
<th>Respondent: 15299201 / Samira Abdullah</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the removal of land from Greenbelt for the provision of two traveler pitches on Puttenham Heath Road to 'enable delivery'. The area warrants Green belt status and should remain in Green Belt. Removal is a big step towards the eventual development of permanent accommodation, which would result in loss of the two pitches.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6254  Respondent: 15586017 / C Maslin  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A55

I object to the removal of land from Greenbelt for the provision of two traveler pitches on Puttenham Heath Road to 'enable delivery'. The area warrants Green belt status and should remain in Green Belt. Removal is a big step towards the eventual development of permanent accommodation, which would result in loss of the two pitches.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6750  Respondent: 15602177 / Julia Hunt  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the removal of land from Greenbelt for the provision of two traveler pitches on Puttenham Heath Road to 'enable delivery'. The area warrants Green belt status and should remain in Green Belt. Removal is a big step towards the eventual development of permanent accommodation, which would result in loss of the two pitches.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7066  Respondent: 15623745 / Stella May  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the removal of land from Greenbelt for the provision of two traveler pitches on Puttenham Heath Road to 'enable delivery'. The area warrants Green belt status and should remain in Green Belt. Removal is a big step towards the eventual development of permanent accommodation, which would result in loss of the two pitches.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPS16/7966  Respondent: 15688481 / Sally Lescher  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A55

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the removal of land from Greenbelt for the provision of two traveler pitches on Puttenham Heath Road to 'enable delivery'. The area warrants Green belt status and should remain in Green Belt. Removal is a big step towards the eventual development of permanent accommodation, which would result in loss of the two pitches.

** images could not be opned **

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Total records: 11.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A56 - Valley Park Equestrian, East Shalford Lane, Shalford
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Policy A56 Valley Park Equestrian centre – 5 homes

Although we know that local residents opposed the application for three temporary pitches (approved in 2012), we have received no representations from them about the current proposal for five permanents pitches on this site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

4. I Object to the proposed enlargement of the traveller site at Valley Park Equestrian within the AONB between Chilworth and Shalford principally as it would spoil public views and perception of the Surrey Hills AONB to train travellers.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

5. Objection 4 - Proposed Travellers Site, Valley Park Equestrian, East Shalford Lane, Shalford.

The site has already been granted permission for 3 pitches and the Local Plan proposal to increase the pitches to 5 would add to the harm caused to the appearance and character of the Surrey Hills AONB.

The site is located adjacent to the Reading to Redhill railway line on the side where there is very little development. Shalford is beyond to the west. The Royal Grammar School's playing fields are to the south and the built up area of Chilworth is to the south east. To the north east is a Pressure Reducing Station but since its structures are small and mostly dark olive green they are not conspicuous in landscape views. Further to the north is a sawmill and fencing contractor's yard on lower ground that has been long established probably before planning control.

The most important AONB consideration is that this is a generally unspoilt stretch of the railway line affording to rail travellers wonderful views of the Surrey Hills AONB towards The Chantries. The existing gypsy dwelling currently significantly detracts from that view. Further dwellings would be additionally incongruous.
The existing dwelling is noticeable and interrupts views of The Chantries from the close and well used public footpath abutting the south of the railway line. The site is not visible from the AONB to the north.

Whilst the difficulties encountered by local Planning Authorities in accommodating gypsies are appreciated, AONBs should be one of the last locations of search or considered to be acceptable for traveller sites. Policy LU1 of the Surrey Hills AONB Management Plan 2014-2019 where specific reference is made to development plan land allocations reads as follows.

"That in balancing different considerations associated with determining planning applications and development plan land allocations, great weight will be attached to any adverse impact that the proposal would have on the amenity, landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB."

Chilworth already has gypsy pitches to the east. Therefore the locality is already playing its part in accommodating the pressure for traveller sites.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1011  **Respondent:** 8848033 / Paul Gerrard  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A56

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is **Sound?** ( ), is **Legally Compliant?** ( No )

I object. It's Green Belt (NPPF 89). What are the exceptional circumstances that require this site to be developed?

It is an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (NPPF 116).

It is an Area of Great Landscape Value.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

Total records: 4.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A57 - The Paddocks, Rose Lane, Ripley
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2702  Respondent: 8565185 / Mr Dave Robins  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT TO site A57 The Paddocks – 4 Traveller Pitches. [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature]
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2955  Respondent: 8590753 / Mr Michael Anning  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7029  Respondent: 8601601 / Mr Roy Dyer  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
We object to the development at The Paddocks, Rose Lane, as this development is also on Green Belt land
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/913  Respondent: 8659489 / Helen Bennett  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
It is important that Travellers sites are carefully monitored to ensure that no casual building or hard landscaping turns a temporary site for Travellers into a permanent dwelling for the lucky few on a precious green belt site. Any permanent structures or landscape changes should be prohibited and vigorously enforced.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7287  Respondent: 8732353 / Simon Marshall  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site A57 The paddocks - 4 traveller pitches.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5985  Respondent: 8812833 / Simon P Hill  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to A57 The Paddocks- 4 traveller pitches.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4552  Respondent: 8813505 / Peter Grimble  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4928  Respondent: 8817121 / Celia Howard  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comment ID:</strong> PSLPS16/7635</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 8837729 / Harry Clarke</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comment ID:</strong> PSLPS16/3460</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 8840161 / Richard Ayears</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Policy A57 (Ripley) – <strong>Object</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Loss of Green Belt Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Extension of Settlement Area of Ripley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comment ID:</strong> PSLPS16/7179</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 8840161 / Richard Ayears</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to Policy A57 The Paddocks because of the harm to the openness of the Green Belt as detailed in the Planning Inspectors report Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/A/14/2228519 The Paddocks, Rose Lane, Ripley, Woking GU23 6NE dated 31st July 2015. Copy attached for inclusion in my objection on Policy A57. The site sit some considerable distance outside of the settlement boundary and is not appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4955</td>
<td>Respondent: 8862465 / Nik Church</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7323</th>
<th>Respondent: 8900641 / Caroline Carr</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I object to site A57 The Paddocks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4095</th>
<th>Respondent: 8907137 / Jennifer A. Milligan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I object to policy A57 The Paddocks, Rose Lane, Ripley. This has been subject to a long running planning battle. Originally one family were allowed to stay there for a limited time. Now you plan to allow 4 traveller pitches for permanent occupation. This is a green field site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/290</th>
<th>Respondent: 8926657 / Lian Grieves</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9) I OBJECT to the site at the Paddocks (Site A57), which is unlawful. 

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/281</th>
<th>Respondent: 8929921 / Caspar Hancock</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9) I OBJECT to the proposed site at the Paddocks (Site A57), which is unlawful. 

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6132</th>
<th>Respondent: 8931233 / John Pemberton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site A57 The Paddocks. This Greenbelt site has also been through the full planning process & the High Court and has been rejected. Why is GBC now proposing to add 3 more pitches & and include the site in the local plan?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4995</th>
<th>Respondent: 8954977 / Patrick Sheard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the proposal to allow the 4 travellers’ pitches at Rose Lane to remain. These pitches have only been granted temporary planning permission until such time as the Council provides sufficient numbers of travellers’ pitches in line with national guidelines. These pitches were constructed without planning permission and when retrospective permission was applied for it was refused by Guildford Borough Council, as was appeal after appeal. Only on the final appeal at national level was temporary permission granted as described above. This site is in the Green Belt and the Council must stick to its previous stance and remove the site form the Local Plan. To do otherwise would encourage everyone to build without applying the necessary permissions in the hope / belief that planning permission would eventually be granted. There must be more suitable sites in the Borough, or adjacent. The appellant stated at the final appeal that what they really wanted was a permanent site to live, the location was irrelevant.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The Society objects to the proposal to allow the 4 travellers’ pitches at Rose Lane to remain. These pitches have only been granted temporary planning permission until such time as the Council provides sufficient numbers of travellers’ pitches in line with national guidelines. These pitches were constructed without planning permission and when retrospective permission was applied for it was refused by Guildford Borough Council, as was appeal after appeal. Only on the final appeal at national level was temporary permission granted as described above. This site is in the Green Belt and the Council must stick to its previous stance and remove the site from the Local Plan. To do otherwise would encourage everyone to build without applying the necessary permissions in the hope / belief that planning permission would eventually be granted. There must be more suitable sites in the Borough, or adjacent. The appellant stated at the final appeal that what they really wanted was a permanent site to live, the location was irrelevant.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (2012) guidance states:

Policy E: Traveller sites in Green Belt

"14. Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.”

There are no such very special circumstances to justify the inclusion of this policy.

2003 Local Plan - Policy HE10: Development Which Affects The Setting Of A Conservation Area

“The Borough Council will not grant permission for development which would harm the setting of conservation area, or views into or out of that area.

11.31 Planning authorities are required to ensure that developments within conservation areas preserve or enhance the character or appearance of that area. The desirability of preserving or enhancing an area should also be a material consideration in the determination of proposals which are outside the conservation area but would affect its setting, or views into or out of the area.”

The site directly abuts Ripley Conservation area. This development does not preserve the conservation area, nor is it an enhancement; the setting of the conservation area is therefore compromised.

Policy D3 supports this view.

The occupants were granted temporary consent for 3 years in 2015 by the Appeal inspector, with full provision for the restoration of the site to its original condition at the end of the period of temporary consent.
Local residents are appalled at the inclusion of this attempt to formalise traveller occupancy in this sensitive green belt location; this is property development by stealth.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6336</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 10430401 / St John the Evangelist (Mark Woodward)</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT TO site A57 The Paddocks – 4 traveller pitches. Guildford borough has already a higher proportion of traveller sites than most comparable boroughs and this should be taken into account when evaluating need for travellers.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3115</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 10616193 / Kate Mumford</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to A57 The Paddocks traveller pitches

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7171</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 10643073 / C Prowse</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Council fought the Planning permission at The Paddocks / Valentines Farm through its many appeals and spent a lot of time, effort and tax payers money on these appeals. To now include this site in the local plan suggests that all that money was wasted. I am sure the council does not want to be accused of wasting tax payers money. The site is still occupied by travellers on Green belt land and should be returned to open fields at the end of the temporary permission and not included in the local plan. Further, the existing occupants are already in breach of the temporary permission and extending this is likely to increase the breaches and destroy even more green belt land.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Comment ID: PSLPS16/7547  Respondent: 10723553 / Judith Pound  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO site A57 The Paddocks – this is unlawful

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2234  Respondent: 10725537 / D. Warriner  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the A57 The Paddocks

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2235  Respondent: 10725537 / D. Warriner  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the on off ramp at Burnt Common this would cause more traffic then Ripley can cope with.

What about infrastructure improvements to the local roads

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5460  Respondent: 10731329 / Sheila Hookins  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/225</th>
<th>Respondent: 10731585 / Robert Thompson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to site A57 The Paddocks which I am given to understand is unlawful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3876</th>
<th>Respondent: 10732193 / Leslie Bowerman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to yet more Green Belt development at The Paddocks, Rose Lane, Ripley. Again, there is no demonstrable need and no exceptional circumstances and traffic would be a problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2793</th>
<th>Respondent: 10756545 / Cornelius Griffin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/1 object to a specific policy re traveller pitches at the Paddocks, Rose Lane. The existing temporary permission has been ignored and the site is now over occupied, has brick structures and is an are for burning domestic and construction waste. This apparently cannot be monitored or enforced at the moment, so a legal extension would be unacceptable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6206</th>
<th>Respondent: 10820417 / Trevor Smith</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to site A57 The Paddocks – 4 traveller pitches which is also inappropriately situated as it is in the heart of the village at the end of a residential street and requiring the demolishing of much needed and currently utilised garages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to site A57 The Paddocks – 4 traveller pitches which is also inappropriately situated as it is in the heart of the village at the end of a residential street and requiring the demolishing of much needed and currently utilised garages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to site A57 The Paddocks as this is unlawful

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

5) I Object to site A57 a The Paddocks - this is unlawful
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6780  Respondent: 10876033 / Lucie Paulson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site A57 for traveller pitchers in Rose lane is part of an ongoing planning issue where planning authority has been repeatedly abused and ignored. For this reason, amongst others, it should be rejected: accepting this proposal simply sends out the message that ignoring Guildford Borough planning authority earns you no penalties and eventually gets you what you want!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7384  Respondent: 10876033 / Lucie Paulson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site A57 for traveller pitchers in Rose lane is part of an ongoing planning issue where planning authority has been repeatedly abused and ignored. For this reason, amongst others, it should be rejected: accepting this proposal simply sends out the message that ignoring Guildford Borough planning authority earns you no penalties and eventually gets you what you want!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4516  Respondent: 10880993 / Roger Knee  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site A57 Rose Lane- development in the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5457  Respondent: 10899233 / Frederick Hookins  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7275  Respondent: 10900065 / Jenny and Guy Marshall  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site A57 The paddocks - 4 traveller pitches.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7282  Respondent: 10900065 / Jenny and Guy Marshall  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site A57 The paddocks - 4 traveller pitches.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/143  Respondent: 10903073 / HEINE PLANNING (ALISON HEINE)  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Strongly support based on recent appeal decision

The family are well integrated into the local community

The site does not harm the setting of the conservation area

Highly sustainable site which could easily be removed from the Green Belt without compromising the boundary

Query however why LPA think there is a need to retain a personal condition if site is removed from the Green Belt
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4805  Respondent: 10910369 / Karen Doyle  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Associated documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/309  Respondent: 10919105 / Susan Thompson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to. Site A57 The Paddocks which I am given to understand is unlawful

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4791  Respondent: 10912001 / Jeff Doyle  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3639  Respondent: 10924769 / Christy Dadswell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
### Comment ID: PSLPS16/7407  
**Respondent:** 10945057 / Margaret Field  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

1. I OBJECT to policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

### Comment ID: PSLPS16/4291  
**Respondent:** 10954209 / Anita Wilkinson  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

[Response has been redacted as it may be considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature.]

[Summary of redacted text: I OBJECT to the inclusion of this site. Firstly I am objecting to the inclusion of a matter that should be dealt with through appropriate channels of planning application. This Draft Plan is a policy document and as such the application to and inclusion of a specific site with a longstanding planning history is inappropriate. The site should be dealt with through the planning application process. The site has been developed without planning permission and enforcement action has been taken in the past. The Draft Plan appears to condone this approach and undermines the planning permission process and the work of planning officers. It rewards Green Belt development and discounts the importance of farmland. It ignores Policy E of the guidance “planning Policy for the Green traveller sites’ which states ‘Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development’. I request that this Policy be removed from the Draft Plan.]

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

### Comment ID: PSLPS16/6487  
**Respondent:** 10960353 / Trish White  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I object to site A57 The Paddocks - 4 traveller pitches - this is unlawful.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2711  Respondent: 11000385 / Sheila Robins  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO site A57 The Paddocks – 4 Traveller Pitches. [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature]

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7559  Respondent: 11000385 / Sheila Robins  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO site A57 The Paddocks – 4 Traveller Pitches. [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.]

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/453  Respondent: 11036321 / Vinciane Ollington  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I Object to the site A57 The Paddocks

Site A57 was part of planning application 14/P/00867 in May 2014 which itself was a blatant re-hash of planning application 09/P/01554. The caravan site had already been established at the time of the application, suggesting that a retroactive application was being sought. The unauthorised development of the site runs wholly contrary to the Council’s planning policies. The Council should attach high priority to its planning enforcement role and should not stand idly by where there are flagrant breaches of planning rules, particularly on a prominent site like this in a Green Belt / Conservation area.
Planning application 09/P/01554 was refused permission by GBC, and the appeal was rejected by the High Court in April 2013. Although the site’s continued occupation has been judged completely illegal, no enforcement action has yet been taken by GBC. GBC should take immediate action on the enforcement notices against illegal occupation. The Council is accountable for protecting the interests of the community and should not run away from its responsibilities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4833  Respondent: 11039681 / Bruce Jeffreson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2956  Respondent: 11040609 / Simon Long  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2953  Respondent: 11098241 / Sammy Chalk  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3305  Respondent: 15063745 / John Pryce  Agent:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the locating of 4 traveller pitches on the A57 Paddocks site, as this is an area of great natural beauty, enjoyed by local residents, and is an inappropriate location for Travellers Pitches.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/271</th>
<th>Respondent: 15068257 / Thomas Tuck</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) I object to site A57 The Paddocks

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/183</th>
<th>Respondent: 15136481 / Roy Padgett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. I object to site A57 The Paddocks which is unlawful.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/207</th>
<th>Respondent: 15138049 / Mark Leonard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to site A57 The Paddocks as this is unlawful

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4453</th>
<th>Respondent: 15140417 / Jeff Greenwood</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4466</th>
<th>Respondent: 15140641 / Sandra Greenwood</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the A57 The Paddocks - this is unlawful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/231</th>
<th>Respondent: 15141953 / R Pomphrey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to site A57 The Paddocks - this is unlawful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/242</th>
<th>Respondent: 15143297 / Ronald Mounsey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to site A57 The Paddocks, this is unlawful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/246</th>
<th>Respondent: 15143393 / Susan Mounsey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to site A57 The Paddocks, this is unlawful.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1602  Respondent:  15150817 / Robert Winborn  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

7) I OBJECT TO Site A57 The Paddocks. Four!!!! traveller pitches are totally out of the question.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/590  Respondent:  15208353 / Janet Green  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

5) I OBJECT TO site A57 The Paddocks- this is unlawful

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/597  Respondent:  15208417 / Colin Green  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

5) I OBJECT TO site A57 The Paddocks- this is unlawful

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/602  Respondent:  15208513 / Lauren Green  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

5) I OBJECT TO site A57 The Paddocks- this is unlawful

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/608  Respondent: 15208545 / Charlotte Green  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

5) I OBJECT TO site A57 The Paddocks- this is unlawful

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/640  Respondent: 15216321 / Douglas Ollington  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I Object to the site A57 The Paddocks

Planning application 09/P/01554 for site A57 was refused permission by GBC, and the appeal was rejected by the High Court in April 2013. Although the site’s continued occupation has been judged completely illegal, no enforcement action has yet been taken by GBC. GBC should take immediate action on the enforcement notices against illegal occupation. The Council should attach high priority to its planning enforcement role and should not stand idly by where there are flagrant breaches of planning rules, particularly on a prominent site like this in a Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1938  Respondent: 15241185 / Jill Gooding  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to strongly object to this plan. The draft local plan includes Policy A57 which proposes 4 traveller pitches to be formally established at The Paddocks, Rose Lane.
The current occupant has temporary consent until 2018, granted by the appeal inspector in 2015; in conclusion, the inspector wrote:

"Overall, therefore, I conclude that "temporary planning permission being granted for a temporary period of 3 years."

This summary by the inspector hardly implies an expansion of the site to 4 pitches, and although the policy specifies single family occupancy, this will be impossible to control and multi-family occupancy will result, if not already in place.

Policy A57 states: "Bricks and mortar housing, or any buildings capable of being converted to bricks and mortar housing, are not appropriate and will be resisted on this site"

As has been reported, a brick dwelling has already been constructed on this site in direct disobedience to the Council's edict.

If this policy is realised, the expansion of this sensitive green belt site is likely to continue indefinitely - on the lines of the West End Farm development which we saw in 2009, which in the end was only stopped by private legal action.

So please register my STRONG objection to this plan. It is not in line with the Green Belt regulations, is not in accord with the atmosphere of Ripley village, and has strong objections from the local residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/861  
**Respondent:** 15245697 / Justine Butler  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO site A57 the Paddocks - this is unlawful.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1086  
**Respondent:** 15265793 / Sam Rowley  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

5 I OBJECT TO SITE A57 THE PADDOCKS

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7974  
**Respondent:** 15278369 / Ripley Parish Council (Jim Morris)  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
108. This site is currently occupied for a traveller caravan site.

109. It is proposed that it should be allocated for 4 traveller pitches. This would be a material intensification of the use. The site is open countryside within the Green Belt and the development would be inappropriate development in this location. The creation of further traveller pitches (almost certainly leading to 8 caravans on the site, four of which would probably be static mobile homes) would seriously affect the rural character of this area and in a way that could not be mitigated successfully in this open location. The site is principally seen from or across the Playing Field.

110. The PSLP should be modified to delete this allocation entirely. Planning permission for the use of the land as a caravan site for 2 static caravans and 3 touring caravans was refused in February 2010. An Enforcement Notice (EN), requiring the cessation of the use of the land as a caravan site, was issued in March 2010. Appeals against the refusal of planning permission and the EN were dismissed in September 2010 following a Hearing with the period for compliance with the EN increased to 12 months. A High Court challenge to the refusal of planning permission was dismissed by Mr Justice Hickinbottom on 10 April 2013. Following this, the EN came into effect. This included a requirement to clear the site by 10 June 2014. This has not been complied with and the EN remains extant.

111. A temporary three year permission was issued following an appeal under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act against the refusal of planning permission in April 2015. The Inspector found that the existing development (a single family use) is out of keeping with its surroundings and detracts from the character of the area, detracts from the setting of the Conservation Area which is a heritage asset, reduces the openness of the surrounding countryside and degrades the rural character of the land that provides a buffer around the Conservation Area which maintains its rural setting.

112. The temporary permission was granted having regard to the personal circumstances of the occupiers of the site and their children but, in particular the Council’s case that it would find alternative sites elsewhere within the three year period of a temporary consent.

113. Instead, despite having contested the current use in two planning appeals and a High Court challenge and contrary to their submissions at the EN and section 78 appeals, the Council now appear to be intending to make the site permanent and to expand it from a single temporary pitch to four permanent pitches; a complete volte face.

114. The scale of damage to Green Belt, landscape character and heritage assets caused by single pitch would be unacceptably exacerbated by increasing intensity of use caused by 4 permanent pitches.

Conclusions

115. RPC objects to this allocation in principle on the basis that it is not sustainable development; its environmental, landscape and heritage impacts are unacceptable, as has been found in two previous planning appeals. It is therefore recommended that the Plan should be modified by the allocation being deleted in its entirety.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1659  Respondent: 15292129 / Shirley Wilson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to site A57 The Paddocks - 4 traveller pitches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1590  Respondent: 15299041 / Elizabeth Teece</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the site A57 the Paddocks as this unlawful and would change the local community. The village cannot cope with anymore cars, traffic on the local roads.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1782  Respondent: 15348481 / Donna Styles</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to site A57 The Paddocks - 4 travellers pitches.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1860  Respondent: 15351873 / Magaret Winborn</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I OBJECT TO – The Paddocks Site A57 – 4 traveller pitches.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO site A57 The paddocks. Four!!!! traveller pitches are totally out of the question.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7589  Respondent: 15422625 / Graham Burrows  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the A57, The Paddocks - this is unlawful

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2813  Respondent: 15426369 / Harvey West  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2838  Respondent: 15426657 / Jean Birkby  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2841  Respondent: 15426721 / S Mayersbeth  Agent:
I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2951  Respondent: 15430369 / Sarah Long  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/2954  Respondent: 15430497 / Martin Chalk  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5455  Respondent: 15448289 / Paul Miller  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3644  Respondent: 15454465 / Marissa Draper  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3643  Respondent: 15454497 / Rick Parker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
1. I OBJECT to policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I OBJECT to policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3631</th>
<th>Respondent: 15454913 / A Burston</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3630</th>
<th>Respondent: 15454945 / Claire Cassar</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3629</th>
<th>Respondent: 15455009 / Emma Graham</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. I OBJECT to policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4503  Respondent: 15486081 / Rosie Ainsworth  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4513  Respondent: 15486177 / Daniel Peyton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4523  Respondent: 15486305 / Noel Ainsworth  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4540  Respondent: 15486849 / Eric Waestaff  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/4618</th>
<th>Respondent: 15486881 / Mark Langton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/4619</th>
<th>Respondent: 15486913 / Sarah Langton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/4620</th>
<th>Respondent: 15486945 / J Hazelton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/4546</th>
<th>Respondent: 15486977 / P Jefferson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4647</td>
<td>Respondent: 15487009 / Yvonne Peyton</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4646</th>
<th>Respondent: 15487105 / Keith Pew</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4645</th>
<th>Respondent: 15487137 / P Doherty</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4638</td>
<td>Respondent: 15487169 / Emily Wigfall</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4635</th>
<th>Respondent: 15487201 / Samantha Dale</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4564</th>
<th>Respondent: 15487233 / Lindsey Schravetta</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4633</th>
<th>Respondent: 15487265 / Helen Smith</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4632</td>
<td>Respondent: 15487329 / Adam Sadler</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4631</th>
<th>Respondent: 15487361 / Roger Dean</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4630</th>
<th>Respondent: 15487393 / Nicola Ford</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4629</th>
<th>Respondent: 15487425 / B Pryor</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4628  Respondent: 15487457 / Aidan Beckett  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4625  Respondent: 15487489 / Luke Draper  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4573  Respondent: 15487521 / A Malcmer  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4624  Respondent: 15487553 / Nicholas Eager  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Emerging local Plan Consultation -Proposed site allocation for the travelling community off Rose Lane, Ripley

We have worked in a professional sense for Alexander Stewart Clark, the owner of the two large industrial buildings off Rose lane and we have watched from a distance (occasionally advising our client) as the travellers who have setup camp off Mr Stewart Clark's track have used the system to get the site that they live on established in the planning system.

We note that Guildford Borough Council's emerging local Plan Document, the Proposed Submission local Plan, is currently out for consultation and it is with dismay that we note that this initial development plan document includes this traveller site as a potential permanent allocation.

In suggesting this site as an allocated traveller site, it appears that the Council has taken the path of least resistance because the residents are already present. We must remind you that the occupiers of the site have, for many years, been in breach of planning regulations. The planning history of the site includes dismissed planning appeals as well as a court in junction to vacate the site-yet nothing has happened and they remain in situ. In brief, this includes the refusal of Planning permission (PP) for the use of the land as a caravan site for 2 static caravans and 3 touring caravans in February 2010 and an enforcement notice (EN) followed. Appeals against the PP and EN were dismissed in September 2010. A high court challenge against these decisions was dismissed in April 2013 and the EN came into effect to clear the site by 14th June 2014. A subsequent application was submitted on 8th May 2014, a month before the EN was due to be complied with and using a change in national policy as the way to have are consideration and delay an enforcement notice.

The last of these applications was refused by the Borough Council and the most recent appeal decision was issued on 3pt July 2015 and granted the appellants temporary planning consent to remain on the site for three years. There are three important conclusions that the Inspector makes in the decision and all point at a site being unsuitable for the proposed use:

- The proposal encroaches into the countryside and is therefore contrary to the purposes of the Green Belt in conflict with policies RE2 and H13 of the GBC local Plan.

- The development of the site detracts from the appearance of the area and is "harmfully out of keeping with its rural setting". The application is contrary to policies G5 and H13 of the GBC local plan.

- There would be some harm to the setting of the Ripley Conservation area.
All these issues would usually result in the refusal of planning permission. However, the Inspector went on to consider the need for traveller sites and concluded that, if the appeal was to fail, there is nowhere for the appellant and extended family to live as "they could not conceive of living in bricks and mortar". The Inspector also had regard to the personal needs of the family with particular regard to the needs of the children and a nomadic existence would make education and healthcare difficult. The removal of the family from the site would "undoubtedly result in Article 8 of the European Convention of Human Rights being engaged".

When assessing Human Rights, the Inspector is obliged to "strike a fair balance between the rights of the individuals concerned and the interests of the community". In making this balance (and he considers in detail both sides of the argument) the Inspector concluded that "the harm to the Green Belt is not clearly outweighed by other considerations and that permanent planning permission should not be granted".

He concluded that the planning balance is different for a temporary decision because harm would be limited in time and reduced. The Inspector was satisfied that the Council will provide traveller sites inline with the requirements above and he was "satisfied that there is a real likelihood that sites will become available so that circumstances will have materially changed by the end of a temporary planning permission. Permission is therefore granted for 3years."

At no point did the Inspector say that this was a suitable site for a travellers' site. In fact, every conclusion made by the Inspector stated that it was not a suitable site for the continued residential use. The Borough Council have a duty to consider these conclusions in preparing the new local plan. It is clear that the Council are taking the easy route here and have effectively concluded that, as that the site has a temporary planning consent, it might as well remain. The Council has failed to take into account the negative conclusions made by the Inspector focusing only on the headline of the appeal decision rather than the conclusions made within. In other words, it is effectively endorsing the approach of the residents to move to the most desirable site possible- in this case, on the edge of the pleasant village of Ripley and its conservation area -and then to find any change in policy to force the Council to reconsider their case, prevent vacation and ultimately have the location ratified through the new local plan.

Whilst we appreciate that the Council has a duty to find traveller sites as part of the emerging local plan, these must be broadly consistent with the Government's policy and not seek to go against national advice (or the Council run the risk of the local plan being found "unsound"). This site must be viewed as though it was an empty and undeveloped site.

In terms of the location of traveller sites sustainability is an important consideration in assessing the acceptability of proposed gypsy pitches. The NPPF is underpinned by the "presumption in favour of sustainable development" and this presumption is evident throughout the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites notably in the following locations:

- Paragraph 4, bullet point 8-"The government's aims in respect of traveller sites are to increase the number of traveller sites In appropriate locations...."

- Paragraph 11 -"LPA’s should ensure that traveller sites are sustainable economically, socially and environmentally"

- Paragraph 21 -"Applications should be assessed and determined in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development"

- Paragraph 23 -"LPAs should strictly limit new traveller site development in open countryside that is away from existing settlements"

This site is completely detached from the edge of Ripley and is therefore located in the open countryside away from existing settlements. To allocate it as a site, GBC would need to remove the site from the Green Belt as the proposed use is not one of the acceptable land uses in the Green Belt. This will effectively create an island of Greenfield land (noting that, despite being occupied, it is not classified as previously developed land) otherwise surrounded by Green Belt, unless the Council are planning on a larger release of Green Belt around Ripley-however this is not suggested on the allocations map.

This suggested allocation should be reconsidered otherwise the local Plan examiner will be asked to contradict the findings of his colleague in the recent appeal decision.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSLPS16/4655</td>
<td>15488193 / Tracey Butler</td>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSLPS16/4669</td>
<td>15494977 / Carol Adams</td>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSLPS16/4696</td>
<td>15495201 / Viliv Viana</td>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4728  **Respondent:** 15495297 / Daniel Perkin  **Agent:**

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4739  **Respondent:** 15495361 / Therese Elizabeth Hill  **Agent:**

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4988  **Respondent:** 15495393 / M Rendell  **Agent:**

I object to policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 travellers pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4989  **Respondent:** 15495457 / R Laroche  **Agent:**

I object to policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 travellers pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 travellers pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4746  Respondent: 15495489 / Stephen Hill  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4754  Respondent: 15495585 / Cristiano Vitor De Oliveira  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4990  Respondent: 15495617 / Peter Elliot  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 travellers pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/4991  Respondent: 15495681 / Pippa Mathews  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 travellers pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5007  Respondent: 15495777 / Michael Lowe  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 travellers pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4764  Respondent: 15495809 / Katie Critchlow  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5009  Respondent: 15495841 / Nicholas Fox  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 travellers pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5010</th>
<th>Respondent: 15495905 / Emma Marshall</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 travellers pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4770</th>
<th>Respondent: 15495937 / C Aruncel</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4779</th>
<th>Respondent: 15495969 / Olivia Doyle</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5012</th>
<th>Respondent: 15496001 / Ryan Hookind</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 travellers pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 travellers pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5023  Respondent: 15496257 / Charlotte Philipps  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 travellers pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5026  Respondent: 15496289 / W.A. McGregor  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 travellers pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4982  Respondent: 15496353 / P.J. McGregor  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 travellers pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/4983  Respondent: 15496481 / R Frampton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) , is Sound? ( ) , is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 travellers pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4984  Respondent: 15496545 / Gillian Frampton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) , is Sound? ( ) , is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 travellers pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4815  Respondent: 15496609 / Dena Parker  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) , is Sound? ( ) , is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4987  Respondent: 15496929 / M Cozens  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) , is Sound? ( ) , is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 travellers pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4825</th>
<th>Respondent: 15496961 / Felix Jeffreson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4986</th>
<th>Respondent: 15496993 / nigel stirraker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 travellers pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4985</th>
<th>Respondent: 15497057 / S McMarken</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 travellers pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4841</th>
<th>Respondent: 15497377 / David Freeborough</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4848  Respondent: 15497441 / Holly Hicks  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4858  Respondent: 15497537 / Caroline Sheppard  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4867  Respondent: 15497601 / Ben Hicks  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4887  Respondent: 15497761 / N Wadey  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4903  Respondent: 15497889 / Hugo Wadey  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4912  Respondent: 15497953 / Rebecca Dougherty  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4920  Respondent: 15498049 / Natasha Howard  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4937</th>
<th>Respondent: 15498241 / Faye Church</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4946</th>
<th>Respondent: 15498369 / Kris Steadman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4972</th>
<th>Respondent: 15498785 / Catherine Elingworth</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5006</th>
<th>Respondent: 15499873 / Pan Illingworth</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5020</td>
<td>Respondent: 15500065 / Rachael Illingworth</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5033</th>
<th>Respondent: 15500513 / Alex Illingworth</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5042</th>
<th>Respondent: 15500801 / Morgan Schooling</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5054</th>
<th>Respondent: 15501217 / Luke Sarti</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5072</th>
<th>Respondent: 15501313 / Matthew Dougherty</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5081</th>
<th>Respondent: 15502049 / Paul Marshall</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5095</th>
<th>Respondent: 15502177 / Steve Plewis</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5101</th>
<th>Respondent: 15502305 / S. Gibbs</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5132  Respondent: 15502977 / Alexandra Morton  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5162  Respondent: 15503105 / Beml Evans  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5168  Respondent: 15503169 / A Palitchell  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5228</th>
<th>Respondent: 15503777 / Elya Koudou</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</strong></td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5234</th>
<th>Respondent: 15503809 / M Pratt</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I OBJECT TO site A57 The Paddocks – 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane</strong></td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5326</th>
<th>Respondent: 15505377 / Simon Wright</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</strong></td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5332</th>
<th>Respondent: 15505409 / Ian Cunningham</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5339  Respondent: 15505537 / Vincent Carley  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5345  Respondent: 15505601 / Emma Robson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5446  Respondent: 15505761 / James McMarken  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5358  Respondent: 15505793 / Edward Goddard  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/5454  Respondent: 15506081 / Dale Miller  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5456  Respondent: 15506113 / Sheila Taylor  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5383  Respondent: 15506177 / Jean Calas-Hathaway  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5458  Respondent: 15506209 / Rosemary Richardson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5459  Respondent: 15506305 / Pamela Sadler  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5463  Respondent: 15506401 / Alicia Robinson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5465  Respondent: 15506433 / Geoffrey Robinson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5389  Respondent: 15506465 / Lisa Garner  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5395</th>
<th>Respondent: 15506625 / Ian Toft</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5408</th>
<th>Respondent: 15506657 / Teresa Laroche</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5439</th>
<th>Respondent: 15506881 / Chloe Brown</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5453</th>
<th>Respondent: 15506913 / Nicholas Mann</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5468</td>
<td>Respondent: 15506945 / Catherine Wyatt</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5485</th>
<th>Respondent: 15507105 / N. Hookins</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5501</th>
<th>Respondent: 15507329 / Manner Kaur</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5507</td>
<td>Respondent: 15507457 / Andre Rose</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5513</th>
<th>Respondent: 15507489 / K Garner</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5537</th>
<th>Respondent: 15507585 / Patrick Laroche</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5543</th>
<th>Respondent: 15507617 / Ewan Collens</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5581</td>
<td>Respondent: 15507713 / Yvonne Connolly</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5583</th>
<th>Respondent: 15507745 / M Grainger</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5584</th>
<th>Respondent: 15507809 / M Smith</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5585</th>
<th>Respondent: 15507841 / Mark Fenner</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5586  Respondent: 15507873 / Andy Tupper  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5587  Respondent: 15507905 / Hannah Lewis  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5588  Respondent: 15507969 / Ian Draper  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5589  Respondent: 15508001 / Lisa Barwick  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5591</th>
<th>Respondent: 15508033 / D Worship</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5593</th>
<th>Respondent: 15508065 / Christina Worship</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6023</th>
<th>Respondent: 15582337 / Peter Hill</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i object to the site a57 the paddocks - 4 traveller pitches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7379</th>
<th>Respondent: 15582337 / Peter Hill</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to A57 The Paddocks - 4 traveller pitches.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7047  Respondent: 15584641 / Miriam Gilkerson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to site A57 The Paddocks - 4 traveller pitches

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7100  Respondent: 15585313 / Kim Styles  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO – The Paddocks Site A57 – 4 traveller pitches.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6169  Respondent: 15585345 / Wanita Styles  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO -A57 THE PADDOCKS - TRAVELLERS PITCHES

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6178  Respondent: 15585409 / Vanessa Styles  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO – The Paddocks Site A57 – 4 traveller pitches.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6741  Respondent: 15602113 / Janet Woodward  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO site A57 The Paddocks – 4 traveller pitches. Guildford borough has already a higher proportion of traveller sites than most comparable boroughs and this should be taken into account when evaluating need for travellers.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7108  Respondent: 15627329 / Loraine Crates  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to site A57 The Paddocks - 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7571  Respondent: 15653505 / Dave Robins  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO site A57 The Paddocks – 4 Traveller Pitches.[Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it]

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7614</th>
<th>Respondent: 15657121 / Robert Wheeler</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to site A57 The Paddocks - 4 travellers pitches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4558</th>
<th>Respondent: 15922337 / Andrew Malcher</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A57 The Paddocks for the provision of 4 traveller pitches in Rose Lane as this is in excess of current requirements within the borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total records: 244.